



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

# Inspector's Addendum Report

## ACP-323199-25

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of 65 dwellings and all associated site works
<b>Location</b>	Lisnamult, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Roscommon County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2360141
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Glenaman Corporation Limited
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Glenman Corporation Limited.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	Caroline & John Nally
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	06/06/2024
<b>Inspector</b>	Darragh Ryan

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1.1. This Report is an Addendum report to the Inspector's Report in respect of 318732-23 dated 22<sup>nd</sup> of July 2024. Permission was sought for a residential development of 65 dwelling units, infrastructure required to service the development, open space and all associated site works on a site of 2.548 hectares on lands in Lisnamult Roscommon, Co Roscommon.
- 1.1.2. The Board issued a Direction under BD-017339 on the 29<sup>th</sup> of August 2024, and an Order on the 11<sup>th</sup> of September 2024, issuing a split decision permission for the development of this site as follows:
- GRANT permission for house numbers 1 to 5 as per drawing number "proposed house/road levels layout plan" dated the 6<sup>th</sup> day of September 2023 in accordance with said plans and particulars.
  - REFUSE permission for house numbers 6 to 65 as per drawing number 2 "Proposed house/road levels layout plan" dated the 6<sup>th</sup> of September 2023

### Reasons and Considerations

1. The part of the proposed development for house number 6 – 65 as per drawing number 2 "Proposed house/road levels layout plan" dated the 6<sup>th</sup> of September 2023 which is located on unzoned land outside of the defined Roscommon Town boundary would, if permitted, would undermine the principles of the core strategy set out in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 -2028, including in particular policy objectives CS2.2, CS2.3 and CS 2.5, which collectively promote sustainable settlement patterns, the direction of growth towards designated settlements and the delivery of zoned and serviced land to facilitate population growth and achieve sustainable compact growth. The principle of this element of development is fundamentally unacceptable and accordingly is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The new "Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities " published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in 2024, require a high quality approach to the design of new housing. It is the policy of the planning authority, as set out

in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 for the area, to ensure that the design and layout of all new housing estates on urban lands to achieve attractive and sustainable development through better design. Having regard to the proposed site layout and house design of numbers 6 - 65, it is considered that the development would not accord with the design principles as set out in Section 12.6 Residential Development of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 -2028. It is considered that this element of the proposed development would, therefore, conflict with provisions of the said guidelines and with the policies of the County Development Plan, would seriously injure the amenities of the area and of property in the vicinity, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 1.1.3. A judicial review of the decision to refuse permission was taken by the applicant. The Board decision was quashed by order of the High Court on the 11th of April 2025. The court order 'states that the file is to be remitted back to the Board, to the point after the Inspector's Report has been prepared for further consideration and determination in accordance with law. It is considered appropriate to remit this appeal back to the point in time following completion of the Inspectors Report dated 22<sup>nd</sup> of July 2024.
- 1.1.4. That the Board invite the applicant for JR to make submissions on the planning application, the subject of these proceedings on the 15<sup>th</sup> of August 2025.
- 1.1.5. Since the preparation of the original report, Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024 – 2030 has been adopted.

Note: Reference to the Board in the sections above and in the subsequent sections of this Addendum Report is appropriate to the time that the direction was issued etc. Also, An Bord Pleanála is now An Coimisiún Pleanála.

## 2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1.1. The proposed site is located on a greenfield site in the townland of Lisnamult to the south of Roscommon town. The site is approximately 1.6km from the centre of Roscommon town. The area to the north of the site is a residential Housing estate known as Abbeyville. There are some houses within this estate currently under construction.
- 2.1.2. Access to the site will be via an internal road within the Abbeyville estate which in turn is accessed off the N63. The site will be set back off the N63 and the line of single dwelling houses to the east of the site which front onto the National Road.
- 2.1.3. The lands at this location would be considered underutilised with scrub and fill associated with the construction Abbeyville present. There is significant levels of overburden and vegetation on the site. To the very west and south of the site is a mature tree and hedge line.

The site area is stated at 2.548ha.

## 3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1.1. To construct 65 dwelling houses
- Internal access roads
  - Connection to existing services
  - Hard and soft landscaping
  - Provision of car parking, and lighting
- 3.1.2. This application is to complete the housing development granted under planning register reference numbers 00/1947, 05/19, 06/1191, 06/1686 and a change of house design granted under planning register reference numbers 16/170, and 21/3010 at Lisnamult, Roscommon.

In support of the appeal the applicant has submitted:

- Traffic Transport and Road Safety Audit
- Design Statement

## 4.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 4.1. Decision

The planning authority issued a decision to refuse for 4 reasons:

1. The proposed development is located for the most part on unzoned lands outside the Roscommon Town Local area Plan boundary would, if permitted undermine the principles of the core strategy set out in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, including in particular policy objectives CS 2.2, CS 2.3 and CS 2.5 which collectively promote sustainable settlement patterns, the direction of growth towards designated settlements and the delivery of existing zoned and serviced lands to facilitate population growth and achieve sustainable compact growth. In addition, having regard to the proposed sitting of the majority of the development on unzoned land in Rural Policy Zone A – Area under strong Urban Influence..... the proposal for multi-unit housing fails to comply with Policy Objective PPH 3.13 which seeks to facilitate single houses in rural areas.....The principle of the proposed development is fundamentally unacceptable and accordingly is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the proposed access arrangements to the subject site being off a heavily trafficked section of the N63 (National Secondary Road), it has not been demonstrated that the additional traffic movements arising from the proposed development would not adversely affect the capacity, safety or operational efficiency of the national road network. It is considered therefore that the proposed development has the potential to endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on this national road. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the applicant has sufficient legal entitlement to access the application site via the existing Abbeyville housing development and to gain access to essential infrastructure such as the public sewer and mains through this housing estate, which

constitutes an unfinished housing development and has not been taken in charge.

4. The proposed development by reason of its design and layout would fail to satisfactorily comply with the design principles set out in Section 12.6 (Residential Urban Development) of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 -2028 and would not provide a sufficiently high-quality residential environment. The proposed development if permitted, would adversely impact the residential amenity of future residents and the residents of existing Abbeyville Housing Development. The proposed development would therefore set an undesirable precedent for similar types of development and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **4.2. Planning Authority Reports**

4.2.1. There is a single planning report on file which can be summarised as follows:

- A small portion of the site .2ha to the north is zoned “existing residential” within the Roscommon Town LAP 2014-2020- this remains applicable and is a material consideration at this time.
- The remaining majority of the site lies outside of zoned lands, on lands identified as Area under Urban Influence as per Section 3.10 of RCDP
- General mix of house types is acceptable however overall design proposal lacks imagination in terms of design concept and layout.
- The provision of private rear open space particularly for units along the northern boundary do not meet minimum requirements for opposing rear gardens 22m, a number of developments do not have minimum 11m rear gardens.
- The extent of variation in house designs is excessive and fails to achieve an acceptable level of consistency that would be complementary across the development.
- No design statement has been submitted.
- The applicant has not demonstrated sufficient legal interest to access the site via the existing Abbeyville Housing estate.

- There is insufficient data submitted to determine that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on the capacity, safety or operational efficiency of the national road network.
- The applicant has not supplied any statement of compliance with DMURS or Roscommon Smart Travel Initiative.
- Lack of nature-based solutions for the management for surface water

#### 4.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

##### Roads Section –

- Have identified a desire line that could form a future strategic link between Lisnamult and the N63 and request that this area be sterilised for the provision of this link.
- A traffic and Transport Assessment is required.
- An auto track analysis should be carried out to ensure access to all areas.

##### Housing Section –

- No Part V agreement is in place.
- The proposed cluster is not acceptable, and units should be dispersed throughout the estate.
- Confirmation of ownership is required to determine whether 10% or 20% applies.
- Detail of calculations of methodology for calculating values for land, site costs, construction costs and profit from these costs are required.

### **4.3. Prescribed Bodies**

#### 4.3.1. Uisce Eireann-

- No objection to the grant of planning permission recommends a number of conditions

#### 4.3.2. Transport Infrastructure Ireland –

- Insufficient data has been submitted with the planning application to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have a detrimental

impact on the capacity, safety or operational efficiency of the national road network.

- The proposed development will be ad variance with national policy
- A requirement that a (TTA) is carried out to assess the impacts of the proposed development in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the TII Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines (2014)

#### **4.4. Third Party Observations**

There were three valid submissions on file. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Concerns regarding traffic congestion and traffic safety.
- EV Parking has not been provided.
- Concerns with respect to shared access to the site with Abbeyville Housing estate and access of emergency vehicles
- Past failures of the applicant to carry out their obligations in Abbeyville housing the installation of speed bumps, replace pillars.
- The management company established by the applicant has lapsed.
- A construction method statement has not been provided.
- Impact on residential amenity due to construction noise traffic etc
- Query as to whether enforcement matters in Abbeyville have been addressed.
- No provision for childcare facilities, shops or recreational area
- The site is not appropriately zoned.
- Concerns regarding extra demand on existing infrastructure
- Concerns regarding compliance with building regulations

## 5.0 Planning History

There are no relevant applications in the immediate vicinity of the site since the assessment of the development under ABP Ref. 318732-24.

- PA reg ref - 23/60049 – Invalid application for the erection of one hundred and twelve dwelling houses
- PA reg ref: 23/60112 – Invalid application for the erection of sixty-five dwelling houses
- PA reg ref: 21/3010 – Extension of duration permission granted to the Glenman Corporation for the following elements of PA 16/170. (1). The completion of 3 no. partly constructed dwelling houses; and (2) The erection of 2 no 2mhigh walls with associated pillars and security gates.
- PA reg ref: 16/170 – Permission granted to the Glenman Corportai on the 19/06/2016 for the for retention and completion for 3 no. partly constructed dwelling houses and PERMISSION - for the erection of 2 no. 2m high walls with associated pillars and security gates on land
- PA reg ref: 05/19 – Permission granted to the Glenman Corporation Ltd on the 16/05/2005 to retain 8 no. Calor Gas Tanks and for Planning Permission for a change of house design with revised site boundaries from that previously granted under Planning Register Reference no. PD/00/1947 in the Register of Roscommon County Council from site numbers 34-96, 121-130 and 158-201 inclusive and for a change of house design on site number 142 from that previously granted under Planning Register Reference no. PD/00/1947 in the Roscommon County Council at
- PA reg ref: 00/1947 – Permission granted to Mr. Michael McSharry on 22/05/2001 for the erection of 201 houses.

## 6.0 Policy Context

### 6.1. National

- 6.1.1. The National Planning Framework – Project Ireland 2040, (2018).

**Compliance with National Planning Framework (NPF) – First Revision  
Relevant new/ updated National Guidance, since the preparation of the  
original report, includes the following:**

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (NPF) – First Revision

The Revised National Planning Framework’ was published in April 2025 and includes revised figures of 50,000 residential units per annum in the years to 2040. The NPF was revised to allow planning for an additional 950,000 people in Ireland between 2022 and 2040.

6.1.2. **Chapter 2** of the National Planning Framework (NPF) is entitled ‘A New Way Forward’ and sets out the role of the NPF.

- National Policy Objective 11 states: ‘Planned growth at a settlement level shall be determined at development plan-making stage and addressed within the objectives of the plan. The consideration of individual development proposals on zoned and serviced development land subject of consenting processes under the Planning and Development Act shall have regard to a broader set of considerations beyond the targets including, in particular, the receiving capacity of the environment.’

6.1.3. **Chapter 4** of the National Planning Framework (NPF) titled ‘Making Stronger Urban Places’ and it sets out to enhance the experience of people who live, work and visit the urban places of Ireland.

A number of key policy objectives are noted as follows:

- National Policy Objective 12 seeks to ‘Ensure the creation of attractive, liveable, well designed, high quality urban places that are home to diverse and integrated communities that enjoy a high quality of life and well-being’.
- National Policy Objective 14 seeks to ‘Regenerate and rejuvenate cities, towns and villages of all types and scale as environmental assets that can accommodate changing roles and functions, increased residential population and employment activity, enhanced levels of amenity and design and placemaking quality, in order to sustainably influence and support their surrounding area to ensure progress toward national achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.’
- National Policy Objective 20 provides that ‘In meeting urban development

requirements, there be a presumption in favour of development that can encourage more people and generate more jobs and activity within existing cities, towns and villages, subject to development meeting appropriate planning standards and achieving targeted growth’.

- National Policy Objective 22 provides that “In urban areas, planning and related standards, including, in particular, height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected”.
- **Chapter 6** of the NPF is entitled ‘People, Homes and Communities’ and it sets out that place is intrinsic to achieving a good quality of life.

A number of key policy objectives are noted as follows:

- National Policy Objective 37 seeks to ‘Ensure the integration of safe and convenient alternatives to the car into the design of our communities, by prioritising walking and cycling accessibility to both existing and proposed developments, and integrating physical activity facilities for all ages’.
- National Policy Objective 43 seeks to ‘Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location’.
- National Policy Objective 45 seeks ‘To increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including restrictions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights’.

#### 6.1.4. **Housing for All – A New Housing Plan for Ireland to 2030, 2021.**

The government’s housing plan to 2030. It is a multi-annual, multi-billion-euro plan which aims to improve Ireland’s housing system and deliver more homes of all types for people with different housing needs. The overall objective is that every citizen in the State should have access to good quality homes:

- To purchase or rent at an affordable price
- Built to a high standard in the right place

- Offering a high quality of life.

## **6.2. Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 - 2028**

### **6.2.1. Core Strategy Policy Objective**

- CS2.2 - Implement all land use planning policy and objectives consistent with the Core Strategy, in order to accelerate a transition to a greener, low carbon and climate resilient county, with a focus on reduced travel demand through the promotion of sustainable settlement patterns.
- CS2.3 - Direct growth towards designated settlements, subject to the availability of infrastructure and services as far as practicable
- CS2.5 - Support the regeneration of town centre and brownfield/infill lands along with the delivery of existing zoned and serviced lands to facilitate population growth and achieve sustainable compact growth targets of 30% of all new housing to be built within the existing urban footprint of targeted settlements in the county. At least 40% of all new housing will be targeted within the existing built-up footprint of the Regional Growth Centre of Athlone (Monksland/Bellanamullia).

### **6.2.2. Rural Housing Policy Objective PPH 3.13**

- Facilitate single houses in rural areas subject to appropriate siting and design criteria, including demonstration of adherence to the principles set out in the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines. In addition, in the case of proposals for single houses in defined Areas under Urban Influence, applicants will be required to demonstrate a social or economic link (as per Table 3.2) to the rural area in which they proposed to build.

### **6.2.3. Towns and Villages Policy Objectives**

- TV 4.18 Promote development at sustainable densities that support compact growth and the consolidation of urban areas (with particular emphasis on Town Cores), and which are also appropriate to the local context and enhance the local environment in which it is located.

### **6.2.4. Infrastructure**

- ITC 7.1 - Support and facilitate the integration of land use with transportation infrastructure, through the development of sustainable compact settlements within the hierarchy of settlements as identified within the Core Strategy and which are well served by public transport.
- ITC 7.3 - Ensure primacy for transport options that provide for unit reductions in carbon emissions. This can most effectively be done by promoting public transport, walking and cycling, and by actively seeking to reduce car use in circumstances where alternative options are available.
- ITC 7.49 - Ensure that developments in urban areas, both within developments and within the public realm, seek to minimise and limit the extent of hard surfacing and paving and require the use of sustainable drainage techniques for new development or for extensions to existing developments, in order to reduce the potential impact of existing and predicted flooding Risks.

#### 6.2.5. Social Community & Cultural Development Policy Objectives

- SCCD 11.10 Require the delivery of new childcare facilities in conjunction with residential development proposals, in accordance with the Childcare Facilities - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2001)

#### 6.2.6. Section 12.6 – Residential Development Urban

- All new urban development proposals will be assessed in accordance with national guidelines and any superseding guidelines for same
- Dependent on the scale and siting of residential development proposals, a Design Statement will be required, and should address the suitability of the proposed design solution to the site context, in accordance with the relevant urban design criteria.
- Table 12.1 – Car Parking Provision.

### 6.3. **Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024 - 2030**

- 6.3.1. The Roscommon Town –Local Area Plan 2024 – 2030 which came into effect on the 25<sup>th</sup> of July 2024. As required under Sections 31AO(5) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) the Planning Authority issued notification of

the Plan's adoption to the Office of the Planning Regulator (OPR). On the 4th September 2024 the Minister of State for Local Government and Planning issued a 'Notice of Intention to Issue a Direction' to the Planning Authority under Section 31 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) ('the Act'). Following on from the Draft Direction and the associated formal public consultation process, the Minister issued a Final Direction in respect of zoning amendments to the Plan. The Plan is now finalised and in effect.

6.3.2. The site lies almost completely outside of the zoning/ town boundary for Roscommon town. Part of the site for houses 1-6 to the north of the site are within the existing residential zoning for Roscommon town as set out within the zoning map for Roscommon Town as set out in the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024 -2030.

- Policy Objective RN1 states the following:

*All residential development proposals will be required to demonstrate compliance with Section 12.6 (Residential Development Urban of Chapter 12 (Development Management Standards as set out in volume 1 of the Roscommon County Development Management Plan 2022 – 2028.*

- Policy Objective RN 3 states the following:

*Ensure the delivery of compact residential growth that aligns with the growth ambitions and density ranges for Roscommon Town, in accordance with the Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)*

- Policy Objective RN 4 states the following:

*Ensure all new residential development proposals demonstrate an efficient use of serviced lands in order to maximise the sustainable use of infrastructure services and facilities in the area, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development.*

- Policy Objective RN 5 states the following:

*Ensure multi-unit new residential proposals deliver and appropriate mix of house type, tenure, density and scale, inclusive of universal design considerations, in order to meet the housing needs of a diverse population*

*including but not limited to those with specialist or unique accommodation needs.*

- Policy Objective RN 7 states the following

*Facilitate additional residential development in established areas, in keeping with the existing residential character of the area and adequately protecting the amenity of existing residential properties in the area.*

#### 6.4. Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

Having considered the nature of the proposed development sought under this application, its location, the receiving environment, the documentation contained on file, including the submission from the Planning Authority, I consider that the following guidelines are relevant:

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

*Metropolitan Towns (>1,500 population) – Suburban / Urban Extension Suburban areas are the low density car-orientated residential areas constructed at the edge of the town, while urban extension refers to greenfield lands at the edge of the existing built-up footprint that are zoned for residential or mixed-use (including residential) development. It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 35 dph to 50 dph (net) shall generally be applied at suburban and edge locations of Metropolitan Towns, and that densities of up to 100 dph (net) shall be open for consideration at ‘accessible’ suburban / urban extension locations (as defined in Table 3.8)*

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) came into effect on January 2024. Full details of compliance with the 2024 guidelines is set out in the Inspectors Report for ABP Ref. 318732-24 dated 22<sup>nd</sup> of July 2024. As the report has been complied De novo these shall be addressed in the assessment of the report below.

- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2023) were revoked and replaced with the Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2025 on the 8th of July 2025. Circular Letter: NSP 04/2025 clarifies that applications in the

planning system including those on appeal to An Coimisiún Pleanála on or before the 8th of July 2025 are to be considered in accordance with the 2023 guidelines. As the proposed development does not consist of any apartments in the design, the above Section 38 guidelines are not considered relevant.

- Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities Department of Arts, Heritage, Gaeltacht 2011
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities’, 2007.
- Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines 2012
- Guidelines for Planning Authorities and An Bord Pleanála on carrying out Environmental Impact Assessment, August 2018 (updated 2019)

#### **6.5. Other**

- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS) (2019).
- Climate Action Plan 2024 and Climate Action Plan 2025.

#### **6.6. Natural Heritage Designations**

- Ballinturly Turlough SAC – 3.3km away
- River Suck Callows SPA – 5.5km

## 7.0 EIA Screening

**See completed form 2 on file.**

Item (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) provides that mandatory EIA is required for the following classes of development:

- Construction of more than 500 dwelling units
- Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2ha in the case of a business district, 10ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20ha elsewhere.

The proposed development comprises the construction of 65 residential units on a greenfield site of 2.54ha. The site is located outside the defined Roscommon town boundary. The site is adjacent to other zoned lands. As such, I am satisfied that the development does not fall within the identified classes of development and does not require mandatory EIA.

Having regard to: (a) the nature and scale of the development, (b) the location of the site adjacent to Roscommon town boundary, (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(3) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), it is concluded that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

## 8.0 The Appeal

### 8.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 8.1.1. This is a first party appeal against the decision of the planning authority to refuse permission. The appeal can be summarised as follows:

### 8.1.2. Zoning

- There are currently no zoning provisions for Roscommon Town CDP. The zoning was carried out in the LAP and Lap expired in 2020 and has not been renewed, replaced or extended. The Board must make a decision in the absence of current adopted plan.
- The original parent permission granted in 2000 was for 201 houses. This includes some of the lands that permission is sought under this application.
- Applicant currently seeking to have lands zoned “residential” within the draft Town Local Area Plan. The applicants sets out a number of reasons as to why these lands should be zoned.
- Lands are excellently located for residential development. (The applicant has provided a list of all services that are in walking distance of the site)

### 8.1.3. Traffic and Roads

- The proposed access to the development is via the existing part of completed housing estate and utilises the same junction on the N63 as was envisaged in the original “parent” permission. The entrance was previously deemed satisfactory to service the development of this scale.
- The access is inside the 50kph speed limit for the town. There are existing housing developments further out from the town.
- A Traffic & Transport Assessment has been submitted as part of the appeal.

### 8.1.4. Property Title

- The developer states there is adequate consents in place to gain access to roads and services through the adjacent housing estate. The developer is the same developer who constructed the dwelling on adjoining lands. A copy of relevant folio has been provided that indicate the necessary roads remain in the same folio.

### 8.1.5. Design and Layout

- The layout is broadly similar to that previously granted under PA 00/1947
- A variety of house types and sizes are provided. Although the council is concerned that there is an excessive mix in the proposal and its visual

incongruence, the applicant contends the mix will work. The variety is not significant with some minor variations on design.

- Having taken note of some of the concerns of the planning authority the applicant has provided revisions for the following:
  - Revisions to the design of some of the gables and finishes of the dwellings
  - Relocation of some of the houses so that house designs of similar design are located beside each other
  - Revised detail either using or omitting brick
  - Revised design detail for house type A & D
- The applicant contends that the open space provision is in line with Section 12.6 of DM standards. Its put forward that the open space is usable large and has a regular shape.
- The applicant states the density of 25.5 units per ha is appropriate for the area.
- The applicant has supplied a design Statement as part of the appeal documentation.

8.2. The applicant was invited to make a submission, on the decision of the Court Order and in response to the publication of the Roscommon Town- Local Area Plan 2025, The following comments were made:

- The applicant has provided a 'Background to Application/ Appeal and refers to the adoption of the Roscommon Local Area Plan. It is acknowledged that the majority of the site remains outside of the town boundary of Roscommon.
- The six houses 1-6 to the north east of the site are within the existing residential zoning of the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024 – 2030. The applicant states that the development of these 6 houses complies with zoning for the site and also in accordance with Section 3.11 of the County Development Plan in relation to completion of unfinished housing estates.
- It is stated that that the adoption of the Roscommon Local Area Plan has altered the land use zoning context surrounding the site. Whilst the majority of

the site remains unzoned under the LAP, it is notable that the LAP boundary was extended to the north -west of the application site include a 2ha, new residentially zoned site. The site which is zoned for new residential is only accessible via a dirt track and lane and is completely disconnected from other land uses.

- It is submitted that there has been a fundamental shift in the need and quantum of residential zoned land in 2025. The revised National Planning Framework identifies the need to accommodate 55,000 new homes per annum across the state to 2034 with a headroom to zone for a total of 83,000 new homes.
- It is submitted that the LAP boundary has been substantively amended since the original permission was granted on site. In adopting the 2014 LAP the County Council was in the situation of having to downzone lands including the proposed development site in order to comply with new legal provisions regarding evidence-based zoning as introduced in the Planning and Development Act. The Council rezoned additional lands in the 2024 LAP however did not include development site in spite of submission to the council regarding a rezoning. The reason given for not zoning the site was that it was incorrectly stated that there was no access to the site.
- Other lands zoned for residential by the council are not based on the sequential zoning approach as set out under the Development Plan guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022. Other lands zoned for residential development should be considered less favourable than the location of the existing lands for residential development.
- The lands subject of this submission to the commission are serviced and located only 900m from the town core and 650m from the railway station. There is a foul sewer connection readily available through the adjoining Abbeyville estate. Surface Water sewer and water supply are also available.

### 8.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

### 8.4. Observations

There is one observation on file. The observation is from a Caroline and John Nally, who made a valid submission to the Planning Authority under the original planning application. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

#### 8.4.1. Traffic

- There is only one singular point of vehicular and pedestrian access and egress from the existing Abbeyville development. The addition of 65 dwelling units will totally incapacitate an already overwhelmed localised traffic system.
- The observer questions the validity of the Traffic and Transport Assessment carried out. The date of the traffic count was 13<sup>th</sup> of December the same day that utility civil works were ongoing on the N63 approaching Roscommon town. As a result of these works many people chose different routes. The results maybe flawed, and it would be more thorough to carry out traffic counts over multiple days.
- There is no secondary access route to the development.
- Construction traffic a serious concern for road safety.
- No EV parking is provided.
- There are no sustainable transport provisions with little or no permeability through the development except by vehicular routes.

#### 8.4.2. Site History and Maintenance

- Concerns that development will not be carried out in a timely manner.
- Questions over existing enforcement proceedings against the applicant
- Questions over maintenance and management of road network. Potholes and damaged footpaths need to be actioned in a timely manner.

#### 8.4.3. Zoning

- If permission is granted on unzoned land – question marks over public consultation.
- Should development be permitted will the existing civil infrastructure be upgraded to accommodate the development.
- Concerns with regard to achieving required standards as set out in the Building regulations

## 8.5. Further Responses

None

## 9.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant national and local policy guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Zoning/ Principle of Development
- Design/ Layout/ Density
- Traffic
- Other Matters
- Appropriate Assessment

The applicant has introduced minor revisions as part of the appeal, including changes to the design of some front elevations and gables of the dwellings, relocation of similarly designed houses, and alternative designs that either incorporate or omit brick. These changes, however, are not material to the overall design and layout of the development. Consequently, I have assessed the application in light of these revised changes but maintain that they do not significantly impact the overall assessment of the proposal.

## **9.1. Principle of Development/ Planning Policy**

- 9.1.1. The site is located to the south of Roscommon Town, approximately 1 km from the town centre (as the crow flies) and 1.7 km by road. The proposed development comprises 65 dwelling houses, internal access roads, connections to existing services, car parking, lighting, and associated hard and soft landscaping. The application seeks to complete the wider housing development permitted under planning references 00/1947, 05/19, 06/1191, 06/1686, and subsequent amendments under 16/170 and 21/3010 at Lisnamult, Roscommon.
- 9.1.2. Only a small portion of the site, accommodating Houses 1–6 to the north, lies within the Existing Residential zoning as set out in the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024–2030. The remainder of the lands are located outside the town boundary and within an Area Under Urban Influence, as defined in Chapter 3 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022–2028.
- 9.1.3. Policy Objective RN 7 of the Local Area Plan seeks to facilitate additional residential development in established areas, where it reflects the existing residential character and protects the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 9.1.4. In determining the previous appeal (Ref. 318732-23), the Commission recommended a split decision allowing five houses within the zoned area. It is now clarified that six dwellings, together with a turning area, can be accommodated within the existing residential zoning. I consider that these six units represent a logical completion of the Abbeyville estate and are consistent with Policy RN 7 and with the Board’s earlier decision.
- 9.1.5. The balance of the lands lies outside the town boundary on unzoned greenfield lands designated as an Area Under Urban Influence. Development in such areas is restricted by the County Development Plan to one-off rural dwellings for applicants with a demonstrated local housing or economic need.
- 9.1.6. The planning authority refused permission for the principle of development on these unzoned lands, citing conflict with Core Strategy Policies CS2.2, CS2.3 and CS2.5, which seek to:
- Direct new housing into existing settlements;
  - Promote compact growth and town-centre regeneration; and

- Deliver new residential development within zoned lands.

- 9.1.7. The applicant argues that the adoption of the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024–2030 and the First Revision of the National Planning Framework (NPF) have changed the planning context. It is stated that other lands, at greater distances from the town core and not serviced, were zoned for residential use and that, on this basis, permission for the entire development should be considered. The applicant further submits that the absence of access was the primary reason these lands were not zoned.
- 9.1.8. The Local Area Plan has undergone full statutory consultation, Strategic Environmental Assessment and all required statutory procedures, and no rezoning of these lands was proposed or adopted.
- 9.1.9. While the applicant’s submissions are acknowledged, the lack of residential zoning remains a fundamental constraint on permitting a development of this scale. In addition, as set out elsewhere in this report, there are design, layout and sequential development constraints that limit the suitability of the lands for immediate residential expansion.
- 9.1.10. The applicant references other zoned lands as a comparison. However, these lands are primarily infill or brownfield sites, aligning with National Planning Objective 7 of the revised NPF, which seeks that at least 40% of all new housing be delivered within the built-up footprint of existing settlements.
- 9.1.11. By contrast, the subject lands are largely greenfield and materially different in planning context and policy alignment. Table 4.1 of the adopted Local Area Plan sets out a requirement for 600 new dwellings in Roscommon Town to 2030, including 180 units on infill or brownfield land, supported by 17.15 ha of zoned residential land. Allowing substantial development on unzoned lands could undermine the sequential zoning strategy applied through the LAP and County Development Plan.
- 9.1.12. Having regard to the National Planning Framework, I do not consider that the First Revision provides justification for large-scale residential development on unzoned lands in this instance. While NPF objectives promote balanced regional growth, such growth is to be implemented through the development plan-making process (NPO 11), which determines where residential development should occur, taking account of environmental capacity, sequential development and compact growth. The revised

NPF does not encourage residential development outside existing zoned lands except in limited and justified circumstances, which are not met here due to zoning, layout, and distance to town centre.

9.1.13. Accordingly, I do not consider that the adoption of the new Local Area Plan or revisions to the NPF materially alter the planning assessment for this location. The proposed scheme would constitute a substantial residential expansion on unzoned greenfield lands, contrary to the Compact Growth principles of the Local Area Plan, County Development Plan and National Planning Framework. The site's distance from the town centre and its position outside the settlement boundary reinforce its unsuitability. It is also notable that the material alterations to the LAP did not include any proposal to zone these lands.

9.1.14. In conclusion, I consider that only the six dwellings located within existing residential zoning are acceptable, consistent with the earlier decision of An Coimisiún Pleanála under Ref. 318732-23. The remainder of the proposal, comprising 59 dwellings on unzoned greenfield lands, is not supported by the adopted national or local planning policy framework and in my view should not be permitted.

## **9.2. Design/Layout/Density**

Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan states that all proposals should present high quality and considered design solutions employing best practice standards. All new urban development proposals shall be assessed in accordance with national guidelines and any superseding guidelines. The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) are the informing guidelines for the design, layout, and density of the development. Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 outlines key indicators for quality urban design and placemaking for settlements, and Appendix D provides a design checklist supplementing this section. Chapter 5 details the development standards for housing, broken down into key areas as follows with respect to layout :

- Sustainable and Efficient Movement: New developments should prioritize sustainable transportation by creating a permeable and legible street network that connects to the wider urban transport system. This enhances active travel through traffic-calming measures, minimizes car parking to manage travel

demand, and ensures safe, comfortable environments for pedestrians and cyclists.

- **Green and Blue Infrastructure:** Promote urban greening and nature-based solutions, such as sustainable drainage systems and slow-the-flow initiatives, for managing urban surface waters in all new developments and retrofitting existing areas to fully harness the benefits of ecosystem services.
- **Responsive Built Form:** Buildings should generally present well-defined edges to streets and public spaces to ensure that the public realm is well-overlooked with active frontages. Key characteristics should include narrow blocks, small plots, and compact layouts with varied forms of open space at multiple levels. Streets should be narrow with small setbacks and integrated parking solutions. New development should embrace good modern architecture and urban design that is innovative and varied, respecting and enhancing local distinctiveness and heritage. Materials and finishes should be of high quality, respond to the local palette, and be highly durable.

9.2.1. Having regard to the site layout I do not consider the proposed scheme adequately applies the indicators as set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines. The layout includes 65 units at a density of 25.5 units per hectare. However, the proposed layout exhibits a linear form of development accessible via a single-entry point through the adjacent Abbeyville estate.

9.2.2. Despite the applicant's design statement emphasising small clusters of housing overlooking useful open spaces, the proposal deviates from these principles. It features one large central open space overlooked by all houses, with no small housing clusters. The layout accentuates the linear development nature of the scheme, particularly evident in the alignment of houses. The easternmost section comprises a continuous row of 19 houses, the northern section bordering the adjacent estate includes 18 houses, and the southernmost section also has a row of 19 houses. This unbroken linear pattern is neither interrupted by landscaping nor diversified by varied building lines. The proposal as presented presents as a mirror of the adjacent Abbeyville estate in terms of layout, with wide spaces between dwellings, lack of sensible connectivity and lack of clearly defined edges to the

streets and open space. The building form and layout are poor, as Chapter 4 and 5 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines clearly outline the need for a responsive built form with narrow blocks, small plots, and compact blocks. The design as presented runs contrary to these principles.

- 9.2.3. Having regard to movement and permeability, the layout as presented is one dimensional with large roadways and footpaths. No bicycle lanes or integrated shared surfaces are provided as required by the guidelines. The Development Plan requires one bicycle parking space per unit equating to 65 spaces – no bicycle parking has been provided in the proposed scheme. The layout is car-dominant, lacking balance between car parking and sensitive design. The scheme in no way establishes a permeable and legible network of streets and spaces within the site that optimises movement for sustainable modes of transport (walking, cycling and public transport)
- 9.2.4. Public Open Space – Policy Objective 5.1 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlement Guidelines seeks the following. Public open spaces should be designed to cater for a range of active and passive recreational needs (including play, physical activity, active travel, cultural uses and community gardens and allotments, as appropriate to the context) and to conserve and restore nature and biodiversity. Policy Objective 5.1 sets out that public open space shall be not less than 10% of the net site area and not more than 15%.
- 9.2.5. While the quantity of open space meets the above objective approx 15.6% of site, I consider the layout of linear houses surrounding one large patch of open space to not satisfy the requirements of the guidelines. No details of potential for active/passive recreation has been provided. No details of how open space has been incorporated into a planned landscaping scheme or SUDS scheme for the site. The design principles being adopted do not adhere to the above policy or any modern planning principles rendering the layout generic and not tailored to the site's unique features.
- 9.2.6. Regarding carparking, there is a significant level of car parking provided throughout the site, with a total of 138 spaces. The level of car parking provided accords with Table 12.1 of the County Development Plan at 1.5 spaces per unit. However, according to the requirements under SPPR 3 – Car Parking of the Compact

Settlement Guidelines, a justification for the proposed level of car parking is required. No details in this regard has been provided with the application. The car parking layout as presented for the most part equates to two spaces per dwelling with only a selected few of car parking spaces remote from the dwelling houses. The car parking is not integrated within the scheme in terms of landscaping. No on street parking is provided as required under the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS), which recommends on-street car parking as a measure for traffic calming while integrating the development into landscaped areas. As stated under point 9.2.3 the layout as proposed is designed for the car, with wide streets and off street car parking. The details as provided does not align with the key indicators for site layout and car parking as set out in the Compact Settlement guidelines.

9.2.7. Having regard to the above, the proposed development does not align with the guidelines for high-quality urban layout and sustainable development. The failure to create distinct housing clusters, the reliance on a single large open space, and the replication of the linear form of the existing Abbeyville estate are significant shortcomings that justify the refusal of planning permission. The design does not meet the requirements for a responsive built form, with a focus on movement and permeability as specified in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines, and thus does not provide a sufficiently high-quality residential environment.

9.2.8. Design/ Unit Mix

**The breakdown of units is as follows:**

House Type	Description	No of beds	Floor area	No of units
A	Detached two storey	4 bed	138.01m <sup>2</sup>	3
B	Semi-detached	4 bed	137.71m <sup>2</sup>	4
C	Semi detached - brick finish	4 bed	127.35m <sup>2</sup>	8
D	3 unit terrace	3 bed	83.5m <sup>2</sup>	6
K	6 terrace units-L-shaped	5 no 3 bed 1 no 4 bed	102.2m <sup>2</sup> to 146.58m <sup>2</sup>	6

M	Detached single storey	2 bed	90m <sup>2</sup>	1
N	Detached single storey	3 bed	98m <sup>2</sup>	5
O	Detached single storey	2 bed	84.56m <sup>2</sup>	1
P	Semi-detached single storey	2 bed	77.63m <sup>2</sup>	4
Q	Detached single storey – brick finish	3 bed	87.33m <sup>2</sup>	5
R	Detached single storey	3 bed	91m <sup>2</sup>	2
T	Terrace of 4 units – brick finish	2 bed	91.58m <sup>2</sup>	12
U	Dormer style semi-detached	4 bed	142m <sup>2</sup>	2

9.2.9. The applicant has not submitted a housing assessment table. However, a comparison of the submitted house type plans with Table 5.1 of the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines suggests that compliance could be either achieved or potentially achievable. While the unit sizes and mix largely align with these guidelines, there are significant reservations regarding the level of detail provided on house design.

9.2.10. According to Appendix D of the Compact Settlement guidelines, the proposed design should have a coherent architectural and urban design strategy necessary for ensuring the development is sustainable, distinctive, complements the urban structure, and promotes a strong sense of identity. In my opinion the development as proposed does not align with these principles. The design statement submitted with the appeal lacks comprehensiveness and fails to provide a justification or contextual basis for the proposed house designs. No details have been provided for the design rational for any of the dwellings proposed or details or architectural consistency. The applicant has changed the location of some of the dwellings from the original

application, however I do not consider these changes alleviate any of the design concerns present around the scheme.

9.2.11. The overall unit mix of 13 different types is excessive. Although uniformity is not an absolute requirement, there should be an effort to maintain a consistent design theme and finishes throughout the scheme. Specifically, the southernmost elevation between units 20-30 proposes five different house types, comprising a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings. Some houses are oriented towards side gables and rear gardens of other properties rather than facing the estate road. The row of detached units from house numbers 29 to 30 on the southernmost elevation is oriented to the west, failing to address the public open space or roadway. Similarly, the northernmost elevation, comprising semi-detached houses numbered 48 to 65, includes four different house types. These house types do not bear an architectural resemblance to the properties on the south. Across the scheme in terms of design there is no architectural consistency, the window openings vary between horizontal and vertical, the proportions between floors are inconsistent, and there is no clear detail provided on finishes or materials. In light of the general lack of detail supplied in relation to design, I am not satisfied the finished house types will represent a high quality design intervention that the site requires.

9.2.12. The overall design proposal, in terms of layout, car parking, and unit design and mix, lacks a coherent design strategy and does not adhere to the principles outlined in the Compact Settlement guidelines. The applicant heavily relies on the neighbouring estate for context in terms of design parameters and layout. The applicant's proposal does not adequately apply the indicators and principles of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines as required under Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 to 2028. The excessive unit mix, lack of architectural consistency, and insufficient design details fail to create a high-quality residential environment. The proposal should be reconsidered to ensure it aligns with the Compact Settlement guidelines, emphasizing sustainable, distinctive, and well-integrated urban development.

9.2.13. Density – New Issue

While I do not accept the principle of the development as per section 9.1 above, for the sake of completeness, I believe it is appropriate to assess density within the

context of overall design and layout. Therefore, I will evaluate density according to the requirements of the Compact Settlement Guidelines as set out under Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan. I note the planning authority did not raise objections on the grounds of density, however the appellant has referenced same under this appeal.

9.2.14. The proposed development's stated density is 25.5 units per hectare. The applicant asserts that this density responds positively to the established neighbouring housing estate and optimises pre-existing infrastructural investments. As per the further submission of the applicant to the Coimisiun on the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2025, the applicant states that the proposed net density is closer to 28 units per ha when one excludes the built road within Abbeyville Estate as well as retention of western and southern boundary hedgerows. While the applicant claims that any objective assessment would then consider the density to be 28 units per ha, I do not agree with the assessment provided by the applicant. I consider that 25.5 units per ha is the correct assessment of nett density in this case.

9.2.15. Roscommon is designated as a "Key Town" within the Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES). Accordingly, the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas & Compact Settlement Guidelines recommend a residential density of 30 to 50 units per hectare for suburban locations. (Table 3.5) The proposed density of 25.5 units per hectare falls significantly below this recommended range. Furthermore, the proposed density does not align with the Core Strategy principles outlined in the Roscommon County Development Plan. Therefore, I consider the proposed density is inadequate and fails to meet both national guidelines and local policy requirements.

In conclusion, having regard to the detail submitted in relation to design, layout and density, I do not consider the proposal accords with the development management standards Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan or Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024. Having regard to the foregoing I recommend planning permission be refused.

9.2.16. Traffic Impact

The second reason for refusal by the planning authority pertains to the proposed access arrangements to the subject site via the N63 (National Secondary Road). It has not been demonstrated that additional traffic movements would not adversely affect the capacity, safety, or operational efficiency of the national road network. The applicant asserts that the access arrangements for the proposed development were agreed upon under parent permission 00/1947. As part of the appeal, the applicant commissioned a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) prepared by Traffic Transport and Road Safety Associates Ltd. This report was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines 2014. The assessment follows the following format:

- Chapter 1: Introduction – Proposed development and scoping
- Chapter 2: Existing local conditions, including the nature of the road network and existing traffic levels
- Chapter 3: Traffic-related impacts of the proposal, including trip generation, distribution, assignment, and junction operation
- Chapter 4: External access and internal access within the proposed development

9.2.17. A traffic count survey was undertaken on Wednesday, 13th December 2023, for an AM peak period from 07:45 to 09:44 and a PM period from 16:00 to 17:59. Based on the traffic count survey data, the local peak traffic hours were established as an AM peak hour of 08:15 to 09:14 and a PM peak hour of 17:00 to 17:59. Concerns were raised by observers regarding road works occurring on the same day as the traffic count. However, given that the N63 is the main thoroughfare into Roscommon town and TII traffic counter sites indicate that traffic was approximately 6.3% above average on the day, I consider the traffic count submitted to be a fair representation of actual traffic conditions around the proposed site.

9.2.18. The assessment of opening and future year traffic generated through the site considers TII Central Growth assumptions, which account for changes in population, job locations, trip distribution, and transport types. The summary of the output for the existing N63/Abbeyville Estate junction, both without and with the proposed development, indicates no significant impact, with only minor queuing and minimal delays expected. The traffic count data is comprehensive and clearly details potential

future traffic in the Abbeyville Estate as part of the development. I do not foresee a significant traffic impact resulting from the development during the operational phase.

- 9.2.19. However, there is a lack of detail regarding construction traffic and its potential impact. The number of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) entering and leaving the site during the construction phase has not been provided. Although potential numbers of workers on site have been supplied, the quantification of trucks entering and leaving the site through the existing estate is missing. In the absence of this information, and considering the potential for significant impact on the amenity of adjoining residential developments, I am not satisfied that the traffic impact has been adequately assessed. Furthermore, the agent for the applicant acknowledges road safety issues at the N63 junction, warranting further consideration through a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit prior to the commencement of development. Traffic calming measures within the proposed development are also required before development begins.
- 9.2.20. While the applicant has demonstrated that there will be no significant impact from operational traffic on the adjoining Abbeyville Estate and N63 Junction, concerns remain regarding construction traffic and its potential impact on the neighbouring estate. These impacts should be addressed either through traffic and transport assessment or through a comprehensive construction management plan, which is necessary for a full assessment of the impacts. Given the foregoing, I do not consider that adequate information has been submitted to allow for a full and rigorous assessment of the traffic impact during construction phase of development.

### **9.3. Other Matters**

#### **9.3.1. Private Open Space/ Separation distances**

Concerns are also raised by the planning authority about private open space provision whereby it was determined that a number of units along the northern boundary do not meet the requirements for opposing rear gardens of 22m and a number of other units do not have 11m rear gardens, hence the development would adversely impact upon residential amenity of existing and future residents in the area. Having examined the open space provision in the context of Chapter 5 of the Sustainable and Compact Settlement guidelines, I consider the quantum the private open space provision aligns with SPPR2 – minimum private open space Standards

for Houses. Having regard to separation distances, SPPR1 of the compact settlement guidelines is the informing guideline for development. In considering a planning application for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses is advised. Having reviewed the proposed site layout, I note all separation distances are in excess of this guideline. I consider the development accords with SPPR 1. While I acknowledge the primacy of the development plan in relation to standards where they are provided, I do not consider the issue of separation distances to be a substantive issue with which to warrant a refusal of permission in this instance.

### 9.3.2. SUDS

While the lack of SUDS measures was not cited as a reason for refusal, the planning authority expressed concern regarding the absence of such measures in the proposed design. The applicant contends that the proposed site is serviced and that there is adequate capacity within the existing surface water sewer. Additionally, the applicant has proposed incorporating surface water "filter strips" from the internal roads and attenuation tanks in the open space if required.

I find the applicant's response insufficient. SUDS should be an integral part of the design and layout, often incorporated comprehensively into the landscaping proposals for the scheme. The applicant's approach may address the quantity aspect of surface water management, but it fails to consider the other essential pillars of SUDS: quality, biodiversity, and amenity.

Although this concern alone may not be substantial enough to warrant a refusal, it highlights the overall design inadequacies of the scheme. A more holistic approach to SUDS implementation is necessary to ensure a well-rounded and effective drainage strategy that enhances the environmental and aesthetic value of the development.

### 9.3.3. Property Title

The third reason for refusal cited by the planning authority is the applicant's failure to provide sufficient information to demonstrate legal title for accessing the site via the existing Abbeyville Estate and to access essential services such as the public sewer and mains. In response, the applicant has submitted land registry documentation

and a folio indicating that the developer of the proposed site is the same entity as the developer of the adjoining Abbeyville Estate. The relevant folio and maps provided confirm that the ownership of the site is identical, thereby establishing that permission exists to access the site through the Abbeyville Estate and connect to other essential services. Based on the submitted documentation, I consider that the applicant has now demonstrated sufficient legal interest to access the site and utilize the necessary services. However, the Board should be aware of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act, which states that a grant of planning permission does not entitle the applicant to carry out any development unless they have sufficient legal interest in the land to do so.

This statutory provision ensures that the granting of planning permission does not override the necessity for the applicant to secure the appropriate legal rights to execute the development. Therefore, while the applicant appears to have addressed the legal title concern, it remains incumbent upon them to ensure all necessary legal permissions are in place prior to commencing development.

## 10.0 AA Screening

10.1.1. I have considered the construction of a residential development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located 3.3km north of Ballinturly Turlough SAC

The proposed development comprises:

- To construct 65 dwelling houses
- Internal access roads
- Connection to existing services
- Hard and soft landscaping
- Provision of car parking, and lighting

10.1.2. 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 European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The proposed works are located on a greenfield site adjacent to serviced land, the applicant has demonstrated connections into public sewer. There are no impacts/effects predicted in this regard.
- Surface Water will be managed through connections in to public waste water network with filter paths proposed to be utilised for the internal road network. Due to the distance of the site and intervening land uses from any SAC and SPA, no impacts/ effects are predicted in this regard.
- There are no identifiable hydrological/ecological connector pathways between the application and the SAC or SPA. This combined with the distance and built up intervening environment between the application site and the SAC & SPA removes any potential connector/receptor pathways. Therefore no impacts/effects are predicted.

10.1.3. I conclude that 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.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 11.0 Water Framework Directive

I have assessed the proposed development for the construction of 65 residential units 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 a surface water

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The best practice standard measures that will be employed to prevent groundwater and surface water pollution from the site.

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.

## 12.0 Recommendation

Grant Permission for house numbers 1 to 6 as per drawing number “Proposed house/road levels layout plan” dated the 6th day of September 2023 in accordance with the said plans and particulars based on the reasons and considerations marked (1) under and subject to the conditions set out below.

REFUSE permission for house numbers 7 to 65 as per drawing number 2 ' “Proposed house/road levels layout plan” dated the 6th day of September 2023 based on the reasons and considerations marked (2) set out below.

### Reasons and Considerations (1)

The part of the proposed development for house numbers 1 to 6 as per drawing number 2 “Proposed house/road levels layout plan” dated the 6th day of September 2023 which is located on a brownfield infill site on land within Roscommon Town Boundary, and having regard to the existing residential zoning in the adopted Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024 – 2030 subject to compliance conditions set out below, would, if permitted, allow for the completion of the existing residential development and comply with the Roscommon Development Plan 2022-2028, including in particular policy objectives CS2.2, CS2.3 and CS2.5, which collectively promote sustainable settlement patterns, the direction of growth towards designated settlements and the delivery of zoned and serviced land to facilitate population growth and achieve sustainable compact growth. This element of the proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## Conditions

1. This element of the proposed development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted to An Coimisiun Pleanala on the 19th day of December 2023, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: in the interest of clarity

2. The turning bay, parking areas, footpaths and kerbs shall comply with the detailed standards of the planning authority for such road works. The developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and of traffic and pedestrian safety

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

Reason: in the interest of visual amenity

4. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Uisce Eireann .

Reason: In the interest of public health

5. The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: the interest of public health.

6. Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any house.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and public safety

7. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: in the interests of visual and residential amenity

8. The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development or until the development is taken in charge by the local authority, whichever is the sooner, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: in the interest of residential and visual amenity

9. A plan containing details of the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials and for the ongoing operation of these facilities shall be submitted to agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.

10. The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.

Reason: in the interests of public safety and residential amenity.

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

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

12. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the satisfactory reinstatement of the site upon cessation of the project coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to such reinstatement. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory reinstatement of the site.

13. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement

in writing with the planning authority [in relation to the transfer of a percentage of the land, to be agreed with the planning authority, in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3)(a), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and/or the provision of housing on lands in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3) (b), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended], unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.

14. (a) Prior to the commencement of the development as permitted, the applicant or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into an agreement with the planning authority (such agreement must specify the number and location of each house or duplex unit), pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, that restricts all relevant residential units permitted, to first occupation by individual purchasers i.e. those not being a corporate entity, and/or by those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.

(b) An agreement pursuant to Section 47 shall be applicable for the period of duration of the planning permission, except where after not less than two years from the date of completion of each specified housing unit, it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it has not been possible to transact each of the residential units for use by individual purchasers and/or to those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.

(c) The determination of the planning authority as required in (b) shall be subject to receipt by the planning and housing authority of satisfactory documentary evidence from the applicant or any person with an interest in the land regarding the sales and marketing of the specified housing units, in which case the planning authority shall confirm in writing to the applicant or any person with an interest in the land that the Section 47 agreement has been terminated and that the requirement of this planning condition has been discharged in respect of each specified housing unit.

Reason: To restrict new housing development to use by persons of a particular class or description in order to ensure an adequate choice and supply of housing, including affordable housing, in the common good.

15. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

## Reasons and Considerations (2)

1. The part of the proposed development for house number 7-65 as per drawing number 2 "Proposed house/road levels layout plan" dated 6<sup>th</sup> day of September 2023 which is located on unzoned land outside of the defined Roscommon Town Boundary would, if permitted, would undermine the principles of the core strategy set out in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 -2028, including in particular policy objectives CS2.2, CS2.3 and CS 2.5, which collectively promote sustainable settlement patterns, the direction of growth towards designated settlements and the delivery of zoned and serviced land to facilitate population growth and achieve sustainable compact growth. The principle of this element of the proposed development is fundamentally unacceptable and accordingly is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The new "Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities " published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in 2024, require a high quality approach to the design of new housing. It is the policy of the planning authority, as set out in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 for the area, to ensure that the design and layout of all new housing estates on urban lands to achieve attractive and sustainable development through better design. Having regard to the proposed site layout and house design of house numbers 7 -65, it is considered that the development would not accord with the design principles as set out in Section 12.6 Residential Development of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 -2028. It is considered that this element of the proposed development would, therefore, 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.

---

Darragh Ryan  
Planning Inspector  
17th of November  
2025

## Appendix 1 - Form 1

### EIA Pre-Screening

**[EIAR not submitted]**

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	323199-25		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construction of 65 dwellings, internal access roads, landscaping, connection into existing public sewer and water supply network		
<b>Development Address</b>	Lisnamult, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?</b>			
Yes		Class.....	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Proceed to Q.3
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?</b>			
		<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Comment (if relevant)</b>
			<b>Conclusion</b>
No		N/A	
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class/Threshold... Item (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2..	Proceed to Q.4

**4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?**

No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Examination required
Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required

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

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

## Form 2

### EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	323199-25	
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 65 dwellings, internal access roads, landscaping, connection into existing public sewer and water supply network	
Development Address	Lisnamult Roscommon, Co Roscommon	
<b>The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</b>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>The proposed development is on a greenfield site circa 2.5ha adjacent to existing zoned land. The lands at this location are not zoned. The proposed development is not exceptional in the context of existing environment.</p> <p>The proposed development will not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants.</p>	No
<p>Size of the Development Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects?</p>	<p>No. The site area is 2.54ha.</p> <p>There are no other developments under construction in proximity to the site. All other developments are established uses.</p>	No
<p>Location of the Development Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</p>	<p>No. The proposed development is not within a designated Natura 2000 site. Ballinturly Turlough SAC – 3.3km and River Suck Callows SPA – 5.5km both located south of the site</p> <p>There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance.</p>	No

**Conclusion**

There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.

EIA not required.

**Inspector:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)