



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323423-25

Development	Construction of two houses and demolition of existing structure.
Location	Station View, Castlerea, Co. Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560014.
Applicant(s)	Paul Colleran.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission.
Type of Appeal	First / Third Party.
Appellant(s)	Paul and Julie Colleran.
Observer(s)	Bernadette Mannion.
Date of Site Inspection	25 th November 2025.
Inspector	C. Daly .

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.636ha., consists of a largely flat open site with a modest block shed to its south and ESB pole at its front. There are some bushes close to the north-west boundary. The site is adjacent to a warehouse type building which is adjacent to the south and west of the site.
- 1.2. The corner site fronts on to the L6561 Local Secondary Road (Church Road) within Castlerea town which runs south towards the N60 (which passes through the town) and it also fronts on to Station View Road, a residential cul de sac. The site is located c.100m of Castlerea train station and is at the southern end of the town of Castlerea in County Roscommon.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Two no. semi-detached two storey houses, with two parking spaces to the side for one dwelling and two parking spaces and turning area to the rear of the other dwelling and new footpath to the front and new vehicular entrance from Church Road.
 - Demolition of existing shed structure.
 - Connection to services and ancillary site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Roscommon County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to a revised design consistent with the Compact Settlement Guidelines and its section on Responsive Built Form including for a substantially narrower plan, finer grained solution of scale (including vertical scale) appropriate to its inner suburban setting which defines and animates Station View Road and Church Road; a revised entrance with the L6561 road access omitted and parking arrangements to the north-west with access on to Station View Road.

Following F.I., the Council decided to refuse permission for two no. reasons related to:

- (1) The design without sufficient responsive built form given the established pattern of development would not meet the required standard of urban placemaking, would not provide a high quality residential environment and would unduly impact on the residential amenity of existing and future residents. This would be contrary to Section 4.4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and to Sections 12.6 (Residential Development – Urban) and 12.16 (Urban Streetscape and Character) of Volume 1 of the Development Plan.
- (2) The proposal would give rise to an unsafe access arrangement which would unduly compromise public safety and give rise to the potential for a traffic hazard. This would set an unwanted precedent for facilitating similar developments with the potential to compromise traffic and pedestrian safety. This would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard due to its location along a heavily trafficked local road where visibility is restricted.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial Planner's Report noted the report from the Roads Department and its concerns regarding the feasibility of achieving the required sightlines for House 1 along the L6561 secondary road and states the applicant should demonstrate such sightlines are achievable. The report noted the site zoning for "existing residential". It noted the design solution was not considered to be a satisfactory response given the established pattern of development. The layout was not considered to address the corner or the adjacent two public roads. It considered F.I. was required in relation to this and the grain, scale and massing proposed. It also considered that F.I. was required in relation to the entrance off the L6561.

The second Planner's Report noted that no design changes were submitted at F.I. stage and considered the proposal unsatisfactory particularly in relation to the failure to define two street edges. It noted the response in relation to the vehicular entrance which it was submitted would have a negligible impact. It noted that the Roads Department did not consider the response to be satisfactory and that the Area

Engineer is of the view that there should be no new entrance on to Church Road. Refusal was recommended for the two reasons summarised in Section 3.1 above.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Department: Further Information required in relation to required sightlines. Following F.I., response deemed unsatisfactory.
- Environment Department: No objection subject to conditions.
- Area Engineer: No report received. Following F.I. various concerns raised including that no access be permitted on to Church Road.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: No objection subject to conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was received which can be summarised as follows:

- The new entrance will result in traffic congestion on a narrow residential road.
- Inadequate sightlines on a bend in the busy road.
- Two houses without green space is a concern.
- There would be a loss of light to property in the vicinity.
- Public lighting is required.

4.0 Planning History

23/60297: Permission refused by the P.A. for two semi-detached dwellings and retention of existing structure as a domestic garage. Reason for refusal related to unresponsive built form to the pattern of development that would not meet the required standard of urban placemaking, would not provide a high quality residential environment and would impact unduly on the residential amenity of existing and future residents.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028

Volume 1

Chapter 2 – Core Strategy and Settlement Policy

Under Table 2.2 Core Strategy Allocations, Castlerea is designated as a Self Sustaining Growth Town < 2,000 population.

Chapter 3 – People, Places and Housing

PPH 3.4 *Encourage innovation in design and require development proposals to be of high quality and make a positive contribute to the built environment and local streetscape.*

Chapter 4 – Towns and Villages

Policy Objective TV 4.4 *Require a design led approach to be taken to sustainable residential development in accordance with the 12 urban design principles set out in the 'Urban Design Manual – A Best Practice Guide' (DEHLG, 2009) to ensure the creation of high quality, attractive, and well connected residential areas and neighbourhoods.*

Policy Objective TV 4.10 *Identify priority intervention projects within towns and villages which will help to provide a 'sense of place' and enhance their existing built environment.*

Section 4.10 Infill and Brownfield Sites

Many development opportunities exist within the towns and villages of the county on infill and brownfield sites, to provide for new development in a consolidated and compact form. Both of these site types, of which many are centrally located, offer excellent potential new development. The redevelopment of centrally located sites offers significant advantages, particularly due to their proximity to existing commercial and community services and facilities.

Policy Objective TV 4.19 *Encourage the appropriate development of infill sites, brownfield lands, and lands identified on the Vacant Site Register and the Derelict Site Register.*

Chapter 7 – Infrastructure, Transport and Communications

ITC 7.39

Ensure that new development proposals connect into the existing public water mains, where available. These will be subject to a connection agreement with Irish Water.

Chapter 12

Section 12.2 Compliance with Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines All development proposals shall have regard to qualitative and quantitative standards outlined in national guidelines issued by the Minister under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The Council will implement all national guidelines including future guidelines or amendments to existing guidelines, where appropriate in the assessment of planning applications, following their adoption.

Section 12.6 Residential Development (Urban)

Design Principles All development proposals should present high quality and considered design solutions employing best practice standards. The Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines for Planning Authorities and the associated Best Practice Urban Design Manual provide guidance on best practice urban design principles.

Section 12.16 Urban Character and Streetscape

Proposed developments should:

- Endeavour to utilise derelict and underutilised structures and sites. The grouping of individual properties in the backland situation may be desirable in order to achieve a coherent design solution in accordance with the appropriate zoning of any given area (if applicable). As a priority, urban regeneration will be encouraged;*
- Respect existing streetscapes in its design, height and scale. Proposals for consideration should be presented in the context of the overall streetscape to enable comparative evaluation;*
- Ensure preservation and appropriate development of buildings of architectural and historical significance (listed buildings and protected structures);*

- *Provide adequate servicing and car parking;*
- *Ensure that traffic management considerations are employed to minimise disruption and traffic hazard.*

Table 12.1 Car Parking Standards

Residential (1-3 bedrooms) Minimum spaces to be provide is 1.5 per unit.

Table 12.3 EV Charging Point Standards

New dwellings with in-curtilage car parking – Installation of appropriate infrastructure to enable installation of recharging point for EV's.

Volume 2

Section 2.2 Castlerea

There will be an emphasis on utilising infill sites and brownfield opportunities, rather than peripheral development patterns which could undermine the vitality of town centres and impacting upon the ability to deliver consolidated urban development.

Policy Objective CA 2 Identify and facilitate the development and renewal of vacant sites, obsolete areas, derelict sites and derelict buildings in a manner appropriate to the area.

Outer Core

Policy Objective CA11 *Maintain and protect the existing residential setting. Facilitate small scale additional residential development, primarily on infill sites, and in keeping with the existing residential character of the area. Suburban type multi-unit residential development will be discouraged in this zone.*

Figure CA 1 Castlerea Land Use Zoning Matrix

Multi-unit residential development is “open for consideration” in the outer core of Castlrea.

A use which is ‘Open for Consideration’ may be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied it is compatible with the policies and objectives for the zone, will not conflict with the permitted, existing or adjoining land uses and conforms with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.2. National Guidelines

Having regard to the nature of the proposed development and to the location of the appeal site, I consider the following Section 28 Ministerial guidelines to be particularly applicable to the assessment:

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) (the Compact Settlement Guidelines).
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines (2009).
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007).

5.3. The National Planning Framework First Revision (April 2025)

Relevant policy objectives include:

- *National Policy Objective 7: Deliver at least 40% of all new homes nationally, within the built-up footprint of existing settlements and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.*
- *National Policy Objective 9: Deliver at least 30% of all new homes that are targeted in settlements other than the five Cities and their suburbs, within their existing built-up footprints and ensure compact and sequential patterns of growth.*
- *National Policy Objective 12: 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 22: In urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular building 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.*
- *National Policy Objective 43: Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.*

5.4. Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Northern and Western Region

Under Section 3.4 in relation to compact, smart and sustainable growth, it states that,

- *30% all new housing elsewhere [outside Galway urban area], within existing urban footprints.*

RPO 3.1 Develop urban places of regional-scale through:

- *Delivering on the population targets for the Metropolitan and Regional Growth Centres through compact growth:*
- *Delivering significant compact growth in Key Towns; and*
- *Developing derelict and underutilised sites, with an initial focus within town cores.*

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.3.3km east of Cloonchambers Bog Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 000600).
- c.3.9km north-west of Corliskea/Trien/Cloonfelliv Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 002110).
- c.5km south-west of Bellanagare Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 000592).
- c.5km south-west of Bellanagare Bog Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004105).
- c.5.1km south-east of Drumalough Bog SAC (site code 002338) and Drumalough Bog PNHA (site code 001632).
- c.6.5km north-west of Moorfield Bog/Farm Cottage NHA (site code 000221).
- c.7.3km north-west of Bracklagh Bog NHA (site code 000235).
- c. 7.7km north-west Lough Namucka Bog NHA (site code 000220).
- c.7.9km south-east of Lough Glinn PNHA (site code 001644).
- c.8.8km east of Lough O' Flynn PNHA (site code 001645).
- c.9.1km west of Castleplunket PNHA (site code 000598).
- c.11.4km west of Mullygollan Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 000612)

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the first party appeal on behalf on behalf of Paul and Julie Colleran can be summarised as follows:

Refusal Reason No. 1

- The proposal is for two appropriately scaled semi-detached dwellings that are a contemporary interpretation of surrounding built forms.
- The site is in a transitional zone between established residential development and local commercial development.
- The proposed development is aligned with planning precedent and the strategic planning objectives for Castlerea and the county.
- It supports the NPF in relation to compact growth and efficient use of serviced land, facilitates residential development within the existing urban footprint and supports mix of housing types.
- The design is an appropriate response to an evolving streetscape.
- The infill, intensification and extensions in the vicinity demonstrate a pattern of development reflective of changing household need.
- It aligns with the evolving context and respects building lines, heights and materiality.

Refusal Reason No. 2

- The concern in relation to traffic safety was directly addressed in the F.I. response which included measured traffic speed data and the existing use of permitted roadside parking.
- The entrance complies with DMURS and TII standards and there is no acknowledgement of the data in the decision of the P.A..

Anomalies and Omissions

- Incorrect or inconsistent applicant details were noted in the official correspondence between the internal departments.

- The submitted photomontages were not acknowledged in the Planner's Report and were either overlooked or not given due consideration.
- The traffic speed data submitted appears to have been entirely disregarded and this is significant given the refusal.

6.2. **Observations**

One third party observation was received from Bernadette Mannion which can be summarised as follows:

- The development will cause traffic congestion in an area with severe parking difficulties.
- The houses directly opposite will obstruct natural light and result in a loss of privacy.
- Her house is made of stone which requires light and air.
- The entrance for house A on a bend on busy road and close to a junction experiencing high volumes of traffic is a concern and it will impact the path crossing the entrance.
- It will be more difficult to drive out of Station View Road with the extra traffic and it will cause safety issues for children.
- Supportive of the refusal of permission by the Council.

7.0 **Assessment**

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

- Urban Placemaking
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic Safety
- Other Issues

7.2. Urban Placemaking

- 7.2.1. I note the site zoning where multi-unit residential development is open for consideration. Given its general compatibility with the policies and objectives for this zone and that it would not conflict with the permitted, existing or adjoining land uses and based on my below assessment, I consider residential use to be acceptable in principle. I note the submitted drawings and photomontages. I note the appeal asserts that refusal reason no. 1 is unfounded. I note the proposed semi-detached dwelling front elevation would face north towards the Station View Road cul de sac and that there would be a modest setback (c.1.6m at the closest point) from the street.
- 7.2.2. I note the hipped roof form and that front elevations with vertical emphasis would address the street and the front elevations would be sufficiently broken up in this regard to not appear unduly monolithic. In my view, this would result in passive surveillance of the street, appropriate animation thereof, would provide a sense of place and enhance the existing built environment of Station View Road consistent with high quality urban design principles per the requirements of Policy Objective TV 4.4 of the CDP.
- 7.2.3. In relation to the south-east elevation that would face on to Church Road, I note that a largely blank gable, with the exception of three windows and one doorway, would address the street. I note that there are a number of gables facing Church Road in the vicinity on the same side of the road to the north. I do not agree with the P.A., having regard to the established pattern of development on this side of the street and the site layout, that there has been a failure to provide a sufficiently responsive built form in relation to this side elevation consistent with Section 4.4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines or in accordance with Sections 12.6 (Residential Development – Urban) and 12.16 (Urban Streetscape and Character) of the CDP.
- 7.2.4. I also note design changes could be conditioned to this elevation to enhance its relationship with the street, such as a reorientation of the property. However, overall the layout of the corner dwelling site, with a large area of hardstanding and car parking to the rear of the dwelling and an overly dominant parking access that would face the street would, in my opinion, result in a poor layout response as it relates to Church Road.

- 7.2.5. I note significant difficulties with the site layout plan in that it shows no provision for useable private open space for the corner dwelling and minimal useable space for the other dwelling. Furthermore, the rear of the corner property is open to Church Road and results in a poor relationship between the public and private realm. I note the CDP makes no specific reference to private open space standards. I note no specific reference is made to the incorporation of the 2007 guidelines '*Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities*'. Accordingly, I consider that I can have regard to the Compact Settlement Guidelines which, for a three-bedroom dwelling, reference a minimum area of private open space of 40sqm and given that this is under SPPR 2 it is a mandatory directly applicable requirement. It also requires that the proposer demonstrate that residents will enjoy a high standard of residential amenity.
- 7.2.6. Noting this, I consider that a regular area of private open space of 40sqm is required to the rear or rear side of each dwelling. I note this could be achieved given the dimensions of the site however, along with other identified issues with the development as proposed, I do not consider that such revisions would be amenable to condition.
- 7.2.7. I therefore consider that the design and layout of the housing and car parking on the site, would fail to achieve a satisfactory relationship with the surrounding streets and would not provide a satisfactory level of residential amenity due to deficiencies in the quality and layout of private open space for the proposed dwellings. The proposed development would not therefore accord with Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan or Section 4.4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines ("Responsive Built Form") or SPPR 2 thereof. I recommend that permission be refused on this basis.

7.3. Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. In relation to the third party observations regarding loss of residential amenity, I note no specific separation distance requirements in the CDP and that per SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines, the requirement is for a minimum separation distance of 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear side of houses and that this does not apply at the front of such properties facing the street.

- 7.3.2. I note the separation distance would be 11m between the opposing dwellings on Station View Road. I consider such separation distance to be adequate to ensure that no undue overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing impacts would result on the residential properties in the vicinity including those directly across Station View Road.
- 7.3.3. I consider that the proposed dwellings, given the internal floor area for a three bed dwelling and subject to standard minimum room requirements, would be more than adequate to ensure a high standard of residential amenity for future residents with the exception of the private open space issue mentioned above.

7.4. Traffic Safety and Parking

- 7.4.1. The appeal has stated that refusal reason no. 2 is unfounded and in particular draws attention to the details submitted in relation to the vehicular entrance on Church Road at F.I. stage. I note that Section 12.24 (Roads and Transportation) refers to sightlines in relation to rural roads only. Accordingly, I note the relevant standard is for urban roads per DMURS as the site is located within the town and is within a 50kph zone. Based on this, DMURS Table 4.2 and Figure 4.63 apply whereby 45m sightlines in each direction are required. Noting this and the sightline drawing submitted, I note this has not been demonstrated to the south where the sightline shown passes through third party lands and in any event extends only to 37m.
- 7.4.2. I note the F.I. submission, which states that internal turning is also accommodated on the site, and that a traffic speed survey analysis was conducted. However, I cannot locate the traffic speed survey on the file. The F.I. response asserts that this confirms that the minimum sightline requirements are met providing for safe vehicular movement to and from the site. It also notes that every house on Church Road has vehicular access so that the proposal is consistent with local precedent. It notes the added width of Church Road in the vicinity of the site.
- 7.4.3. Following my site visit and having observed the manner in which traffic passes the site along Church Road, I note concerns in relation to inadequate sightlines available onto Church Road. Based on this, I do not consider it appropriate or safe to permit a vehicular entrance on to this road particularly when an alternative parking access could be provided from Station View Road to the side of the corner dwelling if the two dwellings were relocated somewhat to the north-west. This would also ensure

that quality private open space could be provided to the rear without a parking space and turning area located in this area.

- 7.4.4. Accordingly, I recommend that P.A. refusal reason no. 2 be upheld in relation to the new vehicular access on to Church Road as in my opinion the proposed development would give rise to an unsafe vehicular access arrangement, which would significantly compromise public safety and give rise to a traffic hazard.
- 7.4.5. I note also that if the new vehicular entrance on to Church Road is omitted that the proposed number of car parking spaces would not accord with the standard required under Table 12.1 of the CDP (residential (1-3 bedrooms) Minimum spaces to be provide is 1.5 per unit). However, in the section on car parking standards preceding this table it states that “*a reduction in the standard of car parking provision in town centre areas will also be considered. Additionally, where a realistic and achievable smarter travel plan can be implemented, a reduction in car parking space requirements may be considered*”. someone this basis, I do not consider that a material contravention of the CDP would arise in this circumstance and a reduction in parking space could potentially be justified having regard to the Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- 7.4.6. Section 5.3.4 of the guidelines in relation to car parking states that “*car parking ratios should be reduced at all urban locations, and should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated at locations that have good access to urban services and to public transport*”. This reflects the provisions of the plan in relation to car parking standards noted above. Given the proximity of the site to the town centre and associated urban services, I consider that one space per dwelling would be justified in this instance.
- 7.4.7. The observer has raised concerns in relation to congestion and traffic safety along Station View Road and Church Road. Given the modest scale of development, I consider that the proposed development would not result in a significant increase in trips to and from the site. In this context I do not consider such concerns to be well founded. I am satisfied that there would be no undue road congestion or road safety issues as a result of the proposed development.

7.5. Other Issues

- 7.5.1. I note the appeal references to strategic planning policy and how the development meets these policies. I have noted CDP policy in favour of infill and compact development in Section 5.0 above and I consider that this, together with the site zoning, encourages the residential development of the site. However, I do not consider that this over-rides urban design policies and considerations and I have conducted my assessment above on this basis.
- 7.5.2. I note the proposed connections to the water and public sewer network with the Council's internal departments raising no concerns in this regard. Should permission be granted, I recommend standard conditions be applied in relation to these matters.
- 7.5.3. In relation to the pre-planning issues raised in the appeal. Insofar as the appellant is seeking to rely on the outcome of any pre-planning meetings that took place with the P.A., I note that Section 37(1)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states: "*that where an appeal is brought against a decision of a planning authority and is not withdrawn, the Commission shall determine the application as if it had been made to the Commission in the first instance and the decision of the Commission shall operate to annul the decision of the planning authority as from the time when it was given.*"
- 7.5.4. Per Section 247(3) of the 2000 Act I also note that such pre-planning meetings are without prejudice to the decision making function and "*cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings*". Accordingly, I note that my assessment of this case is a de novo assessment without regard to potential pre-planning issues raised in the appeal.
- 7.5.5. In relation to incorrect or inconsistent applicant details noted by the appellant, I note that my assessment is based the planning merits of the application and appeal and on no other issues and I do not consider this relevant to my assessment.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed

development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.3.3km east of Cloonchambers Bog Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the nearest European site.
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises construction of two houses and demolition of existing structure.. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
 - The relatively small-scale nature of the development and the connection to the public water and sewer network.
 - The distance from the nearest European site and lack of ecological connections thereto.
 - Taking into account the screening determination by the P.A..
- 9.5. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 9.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located c.527m south-west of the Francis_020 (IE_SH_26F050300) river waterbody (status “good”), is c.550km south-east of the Suck_030 (IE_SH_26S070300) river waterbody (status “poor”) and is above the Castlerea (IE_SH_G_053) waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises two dwellings, demolition of a shed structure and associated site works.
- 10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks 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 reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The relatively small-scale nature of the development and the connection to the public sewer for wastewater treatment.
 - The distance from the nearest surface water bodies.
- 10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would 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 jeopardize any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be refused for one reason outlined below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the policies and provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, the proposed development, by reason of the

design and layout of housing and car parking on the site, would fail to achieve a satisfactory relationship with the surrounding streets and would not provide a satisfactory level of residential amenity due to deficiencies in the quality and layout of private open space for the proposed dwellings. The proposed development would not therefore accord with Section 12.6 of the Roscommon County Development Plan or Section 4.4 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) ("Responsive Built Form") or SPPR 2 thereof. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the policies and provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the failure to demonstrate adequate sightlines from the proposed new access on to Church Road (the L6561) and noting observed traffic movements, the proposed development would give rise to an unsafe vehicular access arrangement. The proposed development would therefore endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, due to its location along a heavily trafficked local road, where visibility is restricted. 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.

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

28th November 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-323423-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of two houses and demolition of existing structure.
Development Address	Station View, Castlerea, 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.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

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

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-323423-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of two houses and demolition of existing structure.
Development Address	Station View, Castlerea, 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 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. Two new dwellings of total 218sqm on a site area of 0.636ha within the built-up area of the town adjacent to a residential area.
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 The built-up urban area of the town consists of residences to the north, businesses to the south and east and a train station c.100m to the south.
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. Modest scale and domestic nature of the development would give rise to no significant environment effects on the site or in the vicinity.

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)