



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ACP-323682-25

Development	Demolition of existing structures and construction of a two storey building, containing four two-bedroom residential units.
Location	58 Renmore Road , Galway , Co. Galway
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560189
Applicant(s)	K King Construction
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	K King Construction
Observer(s)	Joan Gillon Christian Lees and Breda Lees Michael and Genevieve Duffy

Date of Site Inspection:

12th November 2025

Inspector

Bébhinn O'Shea

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0 EIA Screening	9
5.0 Policy Context	10
6.0 The Appeal	13
7.0 Assessment	17
8.0 AA Screening	22
9.0 Water Framework Directive	23
10.0 Recommendation	24
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	24

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening and Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination

Appendix 2 - Images

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located on Renmore Road in Galway City, east of Lough Atalia, in an established residential area. At the southern end of Renmore Road are a number of community/commercial facilities including St Patrick’s Garrison Church, OPW offices and the Army barracks, at the north is the Bon Secours Hospital and Renmore playing pitches. The site is one of a series of 14 dwellings on the eastern side of Renmore Road which are single and two storey dwellings on generous sized plots. The wider area is more densely developed with semi-detached dwellings prevailing.
- 1.2. The application site has an area of .68 hectares and contains a single storey detached cottage with a front projection and a pitched roof. There is a garden area to front with boundary wall and hedge and vehicular access.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to demolish the existing dwelling and construct a two store building containing 4 No. 2 bed residential units and all external works, including a widened site entrance, drainage connections, ancillary sheltered bin store and storage sheds.
- 2.2. The proposed building largely maintains the existing building line and expresses as 2 semi-detached dwellings to the front.
- 2.3. Key figures:

Area of site	0.68 ¹ hectares		
GFA proposed	360 m sqm		
Density	58 dph		
Housing type	Unit 1 – Ground floor	2 bed 4 person	86 sqm
	Unit 2 - Ground floor	2 bed 4 person	86 sqm
	Unit 3 – 1 st Floor	2 bed 4 person	94 sqm
	Unit 4 - 1 st Floor	2 bed 4 person	94 sqm
Private open space	8.7sq m – 9.1 sq m Balcony depth 1.5m		
Communal open space	166sq m (c. 24 % site area)		
Public open space	0		

¹ The application originally stated the site area to be .74 ha however this included the area of the public footpath as identified in the LA planning report, and the area stated has been reduced accordingly.

Car Parking	4 spaces
Cycle parking	2 spaces per unit, in storage shed
Storage	External storage 2sqm per dwelling
Refuse	6 x 240l wheelie bins, in storage shed.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority refused permission for two reasons:

1. The proposed development of four apartments/residential units is in a residential neighbourhood designated as an Established Suburb in the current Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029. It is the policy, under Policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs of the Development Plan to ensure a balance between the reasonable protection of the residential amenities and the character of the Established Suburbs and the need to provide for sustainable residential development. Having regard to the location of the site within an Established Suburb Residential Neighbourhood area and to the character and pattern of development in the vicinity, it is considered that the apartment development, would be contrary to the policy of protecting the character and amenity of Established Suburb Residential Neighbourhood areas and the proposed density of development would exceed the density range set out in Table 3.2 - Area and Density Ranges Limerick, Galway and Waterford City and Suburbs for City - Suburban/Urban Extension Suburban areas of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DHLGH 2024). The proposed development of four apartments would be out of character with the pattern of residential development in the area and would represent an undesirable precedent for further such development within an Established Suburb Neighbourhood residential area and would depreciate the value of properties in vicinity by reason of intensification of use. It is considered the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the development plan and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Specific planning policy requirement SPPR 1 - Separation Distances of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DHLGH 2024) states that when 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, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces. The proposed development with its associated above ground level rear elevation balconies does not meet the above standard requirements, and if permitted, would give rise to undue overlooking of adjoining properties and associated private amenity spaces and thus would detract from residential amenities, and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report noted the following:

- Correct density of development is 58.86units per ha, when the area within the public footpath is excluded.
- Notes policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods and Section 3.6 of the GCDP Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs of the GCDP - in these neighbourhoods, potential exists in the established suburbs for smaller infill development opportunities, subject to certain considerations in terms of pattern of development, form residential amenity.
- The development would result in a negative impact on the character and amenity of the area.

- The impact of the intensification of residential use on the amenities of adjacent dwellings is of concern. The increase in occupancy created by the creation of four units as evidenced by the necessity of individualised private open spaces and additional car parking spaces is out of character with this Established Suburb area
- The development meets the standards of the Apartment Guidelines 2025. Gross floor area of each apartment unit exceeds 73m². Also satisfactory in terms of apartment type, minimum bedroom floor areas/widths, minimum aggregate floors for living/dining/kitchen rooms and bedroom, and various minimum room widths. Exceeds open space requirements.
- In terms of Section 11.3.1 (f) of the GCDP, the gross floor area of the proposed apartment building is 360m² therefore a greater separation distance than 1.5m is applicable. The rear north-eastern and front western sections of the building exhibit a separation distance of c. 1.4m
- The first floor south-east rear elevation balconies would overlook the private amenity spaces of adjoining properties.
- Section 11.3.1 (g) Car Parking Standards. Vehicular entrance of 5.52m is proposed within the context of a front boundary width of approx. 15m, therefore approx. 41.7 %, which is compliant with the CDP development standard.
- Four car parking spaces are indicated on site layout plan to the front of the property, which equates to one car parking spaces per unit plus one visitor parking space. ²
- Part V exception certificate not granted therefore proposed development would be subject to the provisions of Section 96 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).
- Screened out the need for AA
- Screened out the need for EIA
- Concluded that the development was not acceptable based on :

² Appears to be an error. One space for each of 4 units and one visitor space equals 5 spaces

- (i) Contrary to Policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs in relation to suitable infill development
- (ii) Density would exceed the density range set out in Table 3.2 - Area and Density Ranges of the Compact Settlement Guidelines
- (iii) Overlooking by rear elevation balconies and non-compliance with SPPR 1 - Separation Distances of the Compact Settlement Guidelines

Refusal was recommended as per 3.1 above.

3.2.2. **Other Technical Reports**

No other reports.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No submissions

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

I have summarised third party submissions received as set out below. The issues are largely as per the appeal, detailed at Section 7.1 below.

- Development out of keeping with the character of the area.
- Excessive density
- Overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light, overbearance.
- Noise, lighting, nuisance.
- Depreciation of value of property.
- Insufficient parking and turning areas. Overspill parking onto the road.
- Traffic safety at entrance. Contribute to traffic congestion.
- No details of soakway. No details of soil tests.
- Surface water drainage from parking area
- Uncertainty over water supply and sewerage connection
- Need for AA.

- Climate change – no justification for demolition.

Planning History

None on site.

In the vicinity:

17/136 Permission granted for demolition of house construction of a new two storey dwelling at 56 Renmore Road.

18/336 Permission refused for demolition of an existing bungalow dwelling and construction of a 3 no. two storey townhouses & gardens at 37 Renmore Road.

19/150 Planning granted for the demolition of an existing bungalow dwelling and construction of 2 no. two storey townhouses at 37 Renmore Road with dormer accommodation, rear gardens, revised vehicular entrance, parking and associated site works

22/229 Permission granted for demolition of house construction of a new two storey dwelling at 53 Renmore Road.

24/60150 Permission granted for demolition of house construction of a new two storey dwelling, garage and revised entrance 60 Renmore Road

25/60133 and **ACP 323206-25** Permission refused and refused on appeal to sub-divide and construct an extension to the rear of the existing dwelling to provide 4 residential units within the dwelling at 63 Renmore Road.

25/60130 and **ACP 323126-25** Permission refused and refused on appeal to construct new two storey dwelling house with access through existing development at Gurteen Renmore Road.

4.0 EIA Screening

- 4.1. 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.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National:

5.1.1. National Planning Framework – First Revision April 2025

National Planning Objective 22 - 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.

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.

National Policy Objective 45 - Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration, increased building heights and more compact forms of development.

5.1.2. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024 hereafter referred to as “the Compact Settlement Guidelines”.

The Compact Settlement Guidelines outline appropriate density ranges following identification of different ‘area types’. Figure 3.3 of the Compact Settlements Guidelines sets out the process for identifying area types, and associated appropriate density for a plan or development. The density range is first established in accordance with Table 3.1 *Areas and Density Ranges in Dublin*, then having regard to accessibility (Table 3.8) and then having regard to local character/environment/amenity.

Strategic Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) set minimum requirements for Separation Distances (SPPR 1) and standards for Car Parking (SPPR3) and Cycle Parking (SPPR4).

- 5.1.3. **Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025)** hereafter referred to as “the Apartment Guidelines”.

These set out the particular design parameters that apply to apartment development and contain specific requirements in relation to Minimum Floor Areas (SPPR 2) Dual Aspect (SPPR 3) Floor to ceiling height (SPPR4). Minimum requirements for storage, private open space are stated as well as guidance on waste, access, parking etc.

5.2. **Development Plan**

The relevant plan is the Galway City Development Plan 2023- 2029 (GCDP). The following sets out the most relevant provisions of the GCDP to the proposed development:

- 5.2.1. The site is zoned Residential on the Galway City Centre Map B and has a zoning objective “To provide for residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods”.

Residential is considered a compatible use which will contribute to this zoning objective.

- 5.2.2. **Chapter 3 refers to Housing and Sustainable Neighbourhoods.** Four different residential character neighbourhoods are identified within Galway city, namely Outer Suburbs, Established Suburbs, Inner Residential Areas and City Centre Residential Areas. The application site is located within an Established Suburb

- 5.2.3. **Section 3.6 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs:**

Galway has a variety of established suburbs, all of which contribute to the diversity and character of the city. On the east side of the city are established residential areas including... Renmore

Potential exists in the established suburbs for smaller infill development opportunities which can enhance the diversity of house type and contribute to the local character. Infill development will be required to have regard to the existing

pattern of development, plots, blocks, streets and spaces and should not be of such a scale that represents a major addition to, or redevelopment of, the existing urban fabric. The protection of existing residential amenity and character is a priority but must be balanced with opportunities for sustainable high-quality regeneration and appropriately scaled infill.

Such development will be required to demonstrate a positive contribution to the urban fabric, respect and contribute to existing amenity and character and deliver sustainable benefits.

5.2.4. **Policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs** includes:

1. *Facilitate consolidation of existing residential development and densification where appropriate while ensuring a balance between the reasonable protection of the residential amenities and the character of the established suburbs and the need to provide for sustainable residential development and deliver population targets.*

5.2.5. **Chapter 8 Built Heritage, Placemaking and Urban Design**

5.2.6. Section 8.4: Vernacular Heritage

In addition to structures of special interest included in the RPS and designated ACAs, the city contains a wide variety of structures and features, that contribute to local heritage and the distinctive character of the city. That character can be extensively diminished by their loss through demolition and replacement. The Council will encourage the retention and continued use of such structures recognising their contribution to local identity and a continuing sense of place.

Policy 8.3 Vernacular Heritage

1. *Encourage the conservation and rehabilitation, renovation and reuse of existing structures that contribute to the character of the city.*

5.2.7. **Chapter 9 Environment and Infrastructure**

Policy 9.4 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)

5.2.8. **Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives, Development Standards & Guidelines**

Section 11.3.1 (c) Amenity Open Space Provision in Residential Developments

Section 11.3.1 (d) Overlooking

Section 11.3.1 (e) Daylight

Section 11.3.1 (f) Distance between Dwellings for New Residential Development

Section 11.3.1 (g) Car Parking Standards

Section 11.3.1 (h) Cycle parking Standards

Section 11.3.1 (i) Refuse Storage Standards

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

The application site is located c. 260 m to the east and 250m north of Galway Bay Complex SAC (000268) and pNHA, and located c. 260m east and c. 520 m north of the Inner Galway Bay SPA (004031).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appeal first sets out the key figures relating to the development, case for zoning compliance and compliance with core strategy. I summarise the main appeal grounds as follows:

6.1.1. Character and scale

- The proposal exemplifies sustainable and compact development, in accordance with the NPF, Compact Settlement Guidelines and GDCCP, by replacing a single low density bungalow with a modestly scaled well designed apartment building. It is sustainable modest intensification in an area with sustainable transport, local amenities and existing infrastructure. It facilitates housing delivery at a time of acute housing shortage
- In terms of its infill nature, it has been designed to respect the pattern of development in the area. The architectural context in the area is evolving e.g. No. 56 and No. 60 Renmore Road have introduced 2 storey dwellings next to single

storey dwellings. The ridge height of the proposed development is consistent with those of no. 56 and 60. It has been carefully designed to ensure compatibility with the built form. A contextual elevation is submitted.

- The Galway Urban Density and Building Heights Strategy highlights that heights of 2-3 storeys should be open to consideration in this area, rising to 4 storeys near key nodes.

6.1.2. **Density**

- The density is acknowledged to be 58 dwellings per hectare.
- The density is consistent with the GCDP, and Compact Settlement Guidelines. The proposed Bus Connects core bus corridor runs directly along Renmore Road with multiple stops within 500m and other stops on Routes 9 and 10 within 700m.

6.1.3. **Residential Amenity**

- The development has been designed to protect residential amenity and preserve local character. The massing is designed to remain sub ordinate to nearby approved 2 storey developments.
- Combined distance between proposed balconies and neighbouring properties to the rear exceed 16m. All first floor windows on side elevations will be obscure glass. Privacy screens will be installed along the sides of proposed balconies.
- Planting will be retained and enhanced subject to agreement of details. Lighting and finishes will be agreed with local authority.

6.1.4. **Separation distances.**

- The separation distances are less than the required minimum of 1.5 m from side boundaries at two points, but these are marginal shortfalls. The overall building footprint maintains appropriate spatial separation.
- Residential units do not directly overlook private open space from first floor level at a distance of less than 11m. Distance between opposing windows meets the minimum 16m in the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

6.1.5. **Property values**

- Concerns regarding property devaluation are not substantiated by evidence and are not a valid planning consideration under Section 34 of the Act.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

No response received

6.3. Observations

Three valid observations were received:

6.3.1. Joan Gillon:

- The proposal is out of keeping with the character of the area and does not make a positive contribution to the residential amenity and character of the area. Loss of greenery for car-parking spaces.
- Traffic congestion. Renmore Road is a busy access route to residential areas, Department of Defense, OPW offices, barracks, student accommodation, beach/amenities as well as being a main bus route and a rat run. It carries a lot of traffic and the development would make matters worse with overspill parking and access/exit movements. The area is not well serviced by bus routes.
- Climate change: No evidence that the house is in severe structural disrepair and has to be demolished. No justification in demolishing a house that can be lived in. No structural engineering report. No Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan
- Demolition may involve demolition of gable wall of the house which is a boundary wall and the same for 2 sheds in the rear garden. Written consent has not been provided therefore application may be invalid.
- Density out of keeping with the established area and is over development of the site
- Precedent: There are 14 single houses in a row at this location, others could follow suit. Density of 59 uph is too much for the area.
- Overbearance: 2 storey sections very large, extend significantly beyond building line. Will dominate adjacent dwellings. Should have separation distances of 2-2.5

m to side. Does not comply with infill development requirements of section 3.6 sustainable neighborhoods of the GCDP.

- Overlooking from first floor balconies which will be ruinous to amenities of adjacent dwellings. First floor windows, though obscure, will lead to overlooking when open.
- Overshadowing and loss of light. No contiguous rear elevations to assess impact of adjacent dwelling. No impact of loss of light to ground floor windows of proposed units below balconies.
- A road safety audit and traffic impact assessment report should be submitted. Entrance would be 5.5 meters, and beside entrance of no. 59. Sightlines not demonstrated. On street parking can inhibit sightlines. There could be 300 trips per day at the entrance.
- Uncertainty over water supply and sewerage connection. No details of soakway. No details of soil tests. Parking area sloping towards road, not plans for surface water drainage.
- Noise nuisance and lighting from side access to apartments along no. 57 and 59.
- Depreciation of value of property is a valid planning consideration.
- AA should be carried out.

6.3.2. Christian Lees and Breda Lees

- Matters raised are largely as observation above:

Development out of character with the area and would not contribute to residential amenity. Excessive density and site overdevelopment. Contrary to Section 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods. Traffic safety – increased traffic volumes, overspill parking, interference with sightlines on an already busy road. Precedent.

Development would be overbearing and injurious to residential amenity. Requests permission be refused. Photographs included.

6.3.3. Michael and Genevieve Duffy

- Matters raised are largely as observations above:

Development would be completely out of character with the area. Over intensification of use of the site. Overlooking. Contrary to 3.5 of the GCDP. Traffic. Loss of front garden to parking objectionable. Devaluation of houses.

6.4. **Further Responses**

None

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:

- Principle of development (including demolition) zoning, density
- Design and Character
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic and transport
- Water and wastewater
- Other issues

7.2. **Principle of development (including demolition) zoning, density**

7.2.1. The proposed residential development is acceptable in principle having regard to the zoning of the site, and subject to other planning considerations.

7.2.2. I note that while the existing dwelling is not a Protected Structure or listed on the NIAH, it is a dwelling of some vernacular character and I consider that Section 8.4 of the GCDP and Policy 8.3 applies. The dwelling, while not of particular design merit, represents a certain period and evolution in design in the urban area, and contributes to local identity and a continuing sense of place. This character of urban areas can be diminished by the incremental demolition of such dwellings. I consider

that this policy should form part of the considerations of the site re-development proposals. E.g. consideration should be given to the retention of the dwelling into any development of the site.

- 7.2.3. In relation to demolition and climate change, climate change considerations are inherent throughout the GCDP in terms of principle of compact growth, sustainable integrated transport, nature-based solutions, flood risk and water management, renewable energy and the requirement for sustainability statement. These are applied to consideration of the proposed development. There is no specific requirement in the GCDP for a demolition justification statement or submission of structural reports in relation to buildings proposed to be demolished. The GCDP in Section 11.31 sets out where Scheme Sustainability Statements are required; these are typically in relation to larger scale developments, not to developments of this scale.
- 7.2.4. Notwithstanding its vernacular character, I do not consider the demolition of the dwelling unacceptable in principle, in the context of appropriate re-development achieving densification and more compact sustainable settlements. This is assessed below.
- 7.2.5. In terms of Density, having regard to the Compact Settlements Guidelines and Table 3.2 - Area and Density Ranges Limerick, Galway and Waterford City and Suburbs, the site is located in a City -Suburban/Urban Extension Suburban areas i.e. the low-density car orientated residential areas constructed at the edge of cities in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st century. It is a policy and objective of the Guidelines that residential densities in the range 35 dph to 50 dph (net) shall generally be applied and that and that densities of up to 100 dph (net) shall be open for consideration at 'accessible' suburban / urban extension locations. These density ranges are refined further at a local level using the criteria set out in Section 3.4 and Section 3.4.2 is particularly noted in terms of considerations of character, amenity and the natural environment.
- 7.2.6. Although an accessible suburban area within the meaning of the Compact Settlement Guidelines, I consider the density of 58 dph is excessive for this site, having regard to defining characteristics of the area, i.e. prevailing scale and mass of

buildings, urban grain, character and architectural language, and the impact on residential amenity. This is borne out in the assessment below.

7.3. Design and Character

- 7.3.1. Generally, I do not consider the development inappropriate in terms of its 2 storey nature and design character. I note that the design at this stretch of Renmore Road varies and is punctuated with more contemporary additions/replacement dwellings. I consider that a two storey contemporary style could be assimilated into the area.
- 7.3.2. However, the development from the front appears as two semi-detached dwelling which is inconsistent with the surrounding character of single dwellings on generous plots. In addition, the proposed balconies on the front elevation are features not present within the established character of the area. The bulk of the structure extends to 19m deep into the site at a distance of c. 1.4 – 1.6 to the site boundaries, and is incongruous with that in the area, noting even the depth of the replacement dwelling at no. 60 is 12m at its maximum. I consider that the proposed development in its nature and bulk represents a major intervention of differing character into the existing urban fabric and is inconsistent with Section 3.6 and Policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs of the GCDP, and would detract from the visual amenity of the area.

7.4. Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1. As stated above, the proposed development extends to a depth of 19m into the site, approximately 9m beyond the main rear building line of the existing properties, and are at c. 8m in height. I consider that this bulk, at proximity to boundaries would be overbearing to adjacent properties and detract from their amenity.
- 7.4.2. I do not consider that direct overlooking of rear garden areas arises, having regard to the provisions of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and the GCDP and the separation distance retained to the rear of the site. Proposed balconies at rear first floor level, (noted now proposed to be fitted with obscure side glazing), will not directly overlook properties. However, the introduction of an external first floor external element, in my view, introduces a level of disturbance at an elevated level which I consider will detract from the amenities of adjacent dwellings, particularly when also taking into account the intensification of use that arises with 4 households all utilising external space to the rear, as opposed to one current household.

- 7.4.3. Similar issues arise in terms of first floor windows on the side elevation. Again these are proposed to be obscure glazing however they serve a living and dining area. In the event that the Commission is minded to grant permission I recommend that a condition be attached that these windows be fixed panes as well as obscure; means of escape may be provided through openings at the front of the building.
- 7.4.4. Neither the appeal nor the report of the planning authority comment on loss of light, as raised in submissions. In the absence of detailed drawings of the rear elevations of adjacent dwellings, it is not possible to precisely assess the impact of the dwelling on the windows of dwellings adjacent. However, based on drawings and my site inspection I consider it likely that the development will not result in loss of light to rooms beyond standards set out in Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' (2nd edition): A Guideline to Good Practice (BRE 2011) and BS 8206-2: 2008 – 'Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylighting, as per Section 11.3.1 of the GCDP.
- 7.4.5. In relation to external rear gardens of adjoining sites, in my view the proposed development is likely to lead to overshadowing of rear garden areas, particularly at either end of the day, due to its height and depth beyond the existing rear building line.
- 7.4.6. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly detract from the residential amenities of adjacent properties.

7.5. **Traffic and transport**

- 7.5.1. The proposed development is not of a scale that would warrant the submission of a formal Traffic and Transport Assessment, having regard to the thresholds set out in the TII Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines. It is not within the city centre (ref GCDP p. 295) and it is not a development with significant car trip generation potential, (ref GCDP Section 11.11.1 p 312). I do not consider that the development would generate the 300 No. trips outlined in observations as only 4 dwellings and 4 parking spaces are accommodated on site, and I do not consider that it would lead to traffic congestion in the area.
- 7.5.2. Car parking for four cars is proposed. Parking standards for the established suburbs are set out in Section 11.3.2 as

- 1 on-site per dwelling and 1 grouped visitor per 3 dwellings
- 1 space per dwelling if grouped.

Generally, these standards should not be exceeded.

4 parking spaces are proposed and therefore I consider parking provision adequate.

7.5.3. Based on my observations there is adequate sight distance available and I note that the Planning Authority was satisfied in terms of the width of the entrance and did not raise concerns in relation to sightlines. I consider the possibility of street parking obstructing sightlines could arise at any entrances on this roadway. I therefore do not consider that the proposed entrance would raise traffic safety issues.

7.5.4. However, the proposed development would be a significant intensification of existing traffic movement (4 households compared to 1 current household) within a confined space directly adjacent other dwellings which I consider would detract from the amenity of those dwellings.

7.6. **Water and wastewater**

7.6.1. The proposed development is in a location served by public water and wastewater. I consider any perceived uncertainty over wastewater connection may be addressed by a standard Uisce Éireann condition of planning, in the event of a grant of permission.

7.6.2. In relation to proposed soakways, these are a normal part of SuDS proposals. Technical specifications are typically set out in the Building Regulations and BRE 365 and stipulate requirements depending on soil type and percolation characteristics, as well as separation distances from boundaries, structures and pipes/services. Subject to soil characteristics, there is likely to be sufficient space in the rear garden to accommodate a soakway however I note that no other SuDS features are indicated, i.e. rainwater harvesting, green roofs, permeable paving and there is a significant amount of hard surfacing of the site. If the Commission is minded to grant permission for the proposed development, I recommend a condition requiring (i) provision of additional SuDS features and (ii) details of proposed soakway, including percolation tests, in accordance with required standards, to be submitted and agreed with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

7.7. Other issues

- 7.7.1. Section 11.12.5 of the GCDP states that Proposed medium and large-scale developments shall be accompanied by a satisfactory Construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan. Given the scale of the application, a WMP is not therefore required as part of this application. I note however that obligations under relevant waste management standards and legislation remain applicable.
- 7.7.2. I note the development will require the demolition in the applicant's property. Where these affect party walls, this is outside the remit of the planning process. In terms of the legal interest, the applicant has stated ownership of the site and this claim has not been challenged. I am satisfied that the applicants have provided sufficient evidence of their legal intent to make an application. Any dispute arising over works to shared walls is considered a Civil matter and outside the scope of the planning appeal, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.
- 7.7.3. Requirements for Appropriate Assessment are considered below.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S.177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The subject site is located within an established urban area. The application site is located c. 260 m to the east and 250m north of Galway Bay Complex SAC (000268) and c. 260m east and c. 520m north of the Inner Galway Bay SPA (004031).
- 8.2. The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of a two storey building with 4 No. residential units and all associated works. Foul water connection to the existing public network is proposed. Surface water is proposed to a soakhole in the rear garden.
- 8.3. It is noted that one observation considered that an Appropriate Assessment was required to be carried out for the proposed development.
- 8.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The urban infill nature and scale of the works.
- The location of the site within a built-up residential area connected to existing public water services.
- Distance from European sites and waterbodies and lack of any hydrological connectivity.

8.5. 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.

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

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1.1. The surface waterbody Carrowmoneash (Oranmore)_010 is approximately 560 metres south-west of the subject site (Poor water body status). Lough Atalia is part of the Corrib Estuary (IE_WE_170_0700) transitional water body approximately 475 m to the west (good status) and the groundwater body is Clarinbridge (IE_WE_G_008) (good status).

9.1.2. The subject site is located on zoned land within an established residential area in Renmore, Galway City. The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing dwelling and provision of four residential units and all associated site works. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal or by observers.

9.1.3. I have assessed the proposed development 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 water 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.

9.1.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of the works and their nature
- The location of the site, distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.
- Proposed connection to public wastewater network.

9.1.5. 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.

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend permission be refused as set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

It is the policy of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029 under *Policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs* that there is a balance between the consolidation of existing residential development/densification and the reasonable protection of the residential amenities and character of the established suburbs. Having regard to the location of the site and the character and pattern of development in the vicinity, and having regard to the scale and bulk of the proposed development, its proximity to boundaries, proposed first floor balconies and overall intensification of residential use on site, the Commission considered that the proposed development represents excessive density of development within the site, which would significantly detract from the residential amenities of adjoining properties and from the character of the area, and set an undesirable precedent for further such development, which would be contrary to the provisions of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029 and 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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

Bébhinn O'Shea
Senior Planning Inspector

30th March 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	323682-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of dwelling and construction of 2 storey building containing 4 residential units		
Development Address	58 Renmore Road Galway.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? <small>(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)</small>	Yes	X	
	No		
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	X	Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. Class 10 (b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. The proposal comprises 4 no. units.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

		Class 10 (b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. The site comprises 0.74ha.	
--	--	--	--

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No		Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	323682-25
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of dwelling and construction of 2 storey building containing 4 residential units
Development Address	58 Renmore Road Galway City
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>The site is a serviced urban site and its size at .74 hectares is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area.</p> <p>The development would not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance due to its scale.</p> <p>The development, by virtue of its type and nature, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disasters, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.</p> <p>The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing building or developments in the area.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>The subject site is not located in or immediately adjacent to ecologically sensitive sites.</p> <p>It is considered that, having regard to the limited nature and scale of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effect on other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p> <p>There are no sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance within the immediate vicinity of the site.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent,</p>	<p>Having regard to the scale and nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the</p>

nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
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: _____