



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500108-GY

Development	Construction of a dwelling house.
Location	Killora, Craughwell, Co. Galway.
Planning Authority	Galway County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2561102.
Applicant(s)	Ronan Farrell.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal.
Appellant(s)	Eamonn and Nora Gilmartin.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	24 th November 2025.
Inspector	Ciarán Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.266ha, consists of an overgrown mainly rectangular shaped field bounded by stone walls and hedgerow along the front boundary including some mature trees. It is located towards the end of a cul de sac single lane local road/laneway and at the end of a line of detached dwelling houses. There is a two storey dwelling opposite the site in close proximity to the road and there is a small forested area to the south-east and no houses immediately to the west of the site.
- 1.2. The rural site is located c.580m from the edge of the village of Craughwell.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Construction of a two storey detached dwelling house in two pitched roof forms perpendicular to the local road, a detached garage to the rear and tertiary treatment system and infiltration area.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Galway County Council decided to grant permission subject to 14 no. conditions. Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2 requires that use of the house be restricted to the applicant or his family for a period of 7 years and the entering into a legal agreement in relation to same.
- Condition no. 3 specifies external finishes including nap plaster or natural local stone and blue/black roof slates.
- Condition no. 5 requires the provision of a parking space 3m wide adjoining the edge of the margin of the roadway.
- Condition no. 7 requires a new front boundary wall which shall be unplastered and not exceed one metre in height.

- Condition no. 12 includes a requirement for native tree and shrub boundary planting and screen planting on the side and rear boundaries and the retention of any in-situ stone walls, hedgerows or trees except at the entrance.
- Condition no. 13 requires that the garage be for private use only, shall not be used independently or used for habitable or commercial purposes.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report assessment notes the site location in a Class 1 landscape where housing need is required to be established. It notes Policy Objectives RH1 and RH2 are applicable in this regard. It considered that the applicant demonstrated a housing need.

Noting the low landscape sensitivity and the house design and the site context, it considered the design acceptable. It considered the on-site wastewater treatment system to be in accordance with the EPA Code and noted the proposed connection to the local group water scheme. It noted sightlines in accordance with the relevant standards.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Gort Area Office: No report received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Not applicable.

3.4. Third Party Observations

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

- The design is not sensitive to the rural landscape and it will block views of same.
- The position of the rear element behind the adjacent building line will result in overlooking of adjacent living space and patio to the east.
- The east-west orientation is at odds with the neighbouring houses which all have the longer front elevations facing the public road.

- The site slopes downhill such that backfilling will be necessary and this will result in a higher floor level towards the rear with overlooking resulting.
- There are no contiguous elevations showing the impact of the development.
- The garage at 59.4sqm is in excess of the guidelines and will have a negative impact on the adjacent garden and its views with no precedent in the vicinity.
- There is evidence of flooding to the south of the site and this will have a detrimental impact on the adjacent property.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

07/1387: Permission refused by the P.A. and refused on appeal (ABP ref. PL 07.225307) to construct one dwelling house, septic tank, percolation area and garage.

Reason for refusal including that it would constitute an excessive density of suburban type non-essential development in an unserviced area, would be ribbon development and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment.

Adjacent Site

024924: Permission granted at adjacent site to the east by the P.A. for a two storey pitched roof dwelling house and septic tank.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the CDP)

Chapter 4 – Rural Living and Development

Policy Objective RC2 Rural Housing in the Countryside

To manage the development of rural housing in the open countryside by requiring applicants to demonstrate compliance with the Rural Housing Policy Objectives as outlined in Section 4.6.3.

Map 4.2 shows that the site is located within a Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure and within the Galway County Transport and Planning Study Area (GCTPS).

RH 2 Rural Housing Zone 2 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure GCTPS- Outside Rural Metropolitan Area Zone 1)

It is policy objective to facilitate rural housing in this rural area under strong urban pressure subject to the following criteria: 1 (a) Those applicants with long standing demonstrable economic and/or social Rural Links or Need to the area through existing and immediate family ties seeking to develop their first home on the existing family farm holding. Consideration shall be given to special circumstances where a landowner has no immediate family and wishes to accommodate a niece or nephew on family lands. Documentary evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis. OR in relation to the other 6 no. listed criteria under Policy Objective RH 2.*

** Rural Links For the purpose of the above is defined as a person who has strong demonstrable economic or social links to the rural area and wishes to build a dwelling generally within an 8km radius of where the applicant has lived for a substantial continuous part of their life. To have lived in the area for a continuous seven years or more is to be recognised as a substantial, continuous part of life and also as the minimum period required to be deemed longstanding residents of the area.*

Chapter 8 – Tourism and Landscape

Per Map 8.2 Landscape Sensitivity the site is located within the low (1) area which it is stated is “*unlikely to be adversely affected by change*”.

Chapter 15 – Development Management Standards

DM Standard 6: Domestic Garages (Urban and Rural)

- *The design, form and materials should be ancillary to, and consistent with the main dwelling on site;*
- *Structures may be detached or connected to the dwelling but should be visually subservient in terms of size, scale and bulk;*

- *Storage facilities should be used solely for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and not for any commercial, manufacturing, industrial use or habitable space in the absence of prior planning consent for such use.*

DM Standard 7: Rural Housing

In order to substantiate a rural housing need the following documentation will be required:

- *Justification for location as proposed;*
- *Land registry maps and associated documentation; • Proof of local connection to an area;*
- *Any other details that may be deemed necessary at time of application by the Planning Authority.*

DM Standard 8 sets out Site Selection and Design guidance including that “*the scale, form, design and siting of the development should be sensitive to its surroundings and visually integrate with the receiving landscape*” and that “*a large house requires a large site to ensure effective integration into its surroundings (either immediately or in the future, through planned screening)*”.

DM Standard 9: Site Sizes for Single Houses Using Individual On-Site Wastewater Treatment Systems

- *A minimum site size of 2000m² is generally required for a single house so as to provide for adequate effluent treatment, parking, landscaping, open space and maintenance of rural amenity.*
- *For house sizes, with a Floor Footprint greater than 200m². The site size shall be increased by 10m² for each 1 m² of house footprint area above 200m².*
- *Special consideration will be given to existing houses and to proposed developments who can demonstrate Rural Housing Need and comply with EPA guidelines where the minimum size is not totally achievable. For house sizes, with a site size less than 2000m². The house footprint shall be decreased by 1 m² of house area for each 10m² below 2000m².*

DM Standard 11 requires landscaping proposals with each application.

DM Standard 28 provides Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads

Per Table 15.3 the applicable minimum is 70m for a speed limit design of 50kph, 50m for 42kph and 35m for 30kph design speed.

DM Standard 29: Building Lines requires a 15m setback from local roads.

Table 15.5 (Car Parking Standards) requires two parking spaces per 4+bedroom dwelling.

DM Standard 68: Flooding Flood Zones and Appropriate Uses

...Where developments/land uses are proposed that are considered inappropriate to the Flood Zone, then a Development Management Justification Test and site-specific Flood Risk Assessment will be required in accordance with The Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines 2009 (and as updated).

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.1.01km south-east of Rahasane Turlough Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Proposed Natural Heritage Area (PNHA) (site code 000322).
- c.1.1km south-east of Rahasane Turlough Special Protection Area (SPA) (site code 004089).
- c.6.05km north-east of Castletaylor Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000242).
- c.7.5km north-west of Slieve Aughty Mountains SPA (site code 004168).
- c.8.2km north-east of Ardrahan Grassland SAC (site code 002244).
- c.8.5km north-east of Lough Fingall Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000606).
- c.8.6km north-east of Kiltiernan Turlough SAC (site code 001285).
- c.8.9km north of Peterswell Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 000318).
- c.8.9km north-west of Sonnagh Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 001913).
- c.9.3km east of Galway Bay Complex SAC (site code 000268).

- c.11.4km north-east of Carrowbaun, Newhall and Ballylee Turloughs SAC (site code 002293).
- c.11.6km north-east of Ballinduff Turlough SAC (site code 002295).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal by Eamonn and Nora Gilmartin can be summarised as follows:

- The site elevations will be substantially higher than the residential site to the east and there is no indication on the plans for a retaining wall to the east to prevent collapse of the newly elevated site into their property.
- The new high ground level to the rear would enable extensive overlooking of adjacent property to the east including of living spaces and gardens.
- The newly elevated site will be higher than the side boundary fencing of their rear garden and no indications as to how damage will be prevented.
- There is inadequate information in relation to how drainage on to the adjacent site will be prevented.
- The subject site and their adjacent site have flooded in the past and the change in site levels may have a detrimental effect in this regard.
- The proposed tree planting of a silver birch in close proximity to the east boundary could mean roots and branches could impinge on the adjacent property and is incongruous with Condition no. 6 in relation to sight lines.
- In relation to the proposed planting of field maple, hawthorn, beech and Portuguese laurel there is no indication of distance to the site boundary so that plants and roots/branches do not grow into their site , do not pose a health risk to their children and in relation to maintenance from the subject site to prevent encroachment.
- Photos of the fencing and flooding, as well as OPW letter, attached to the appeal.

- Site layout plan and section drawings attached.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response has been received on behalf of the applicant which can be summarised as follows:

- The existing adjacent house has a finished floor level 400mm above the applicant's finished floor level with the living quarters 700mm below the entrance level which is 1.1m below the adjacent dwelling.
- The garage is at a level 2.4m below the finished floor level of the adjacent dwelling.
- The applicant wishes to retain the fence and harmonise his dwelling and site works into the existing landscape by grading the lawns and roadways.
- All soakaways will be below the level of the adjacent site.
- In relation to flood risk, the Planner's Report noted that the site is not within a flood risk area such that no flood risk assessment is required.
- The applicant has indicated he will maintain any foliage planted at the site.
- Additional drawings attached showing site levels.

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
- Design and Amenity
- Wastewater Treatment
- Other Issues

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. I note the site location within a Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure GCTPS-Outside Rural Metropolitan Area Zone 1. In these areas applicants are required to demonstrate an economic or social rural link or need. I note the Planner's Report accepted the submitted land registry and folio documents in relation to the family home and lands, the school letters, birth certificate, housing need form and other letters as meeting the requirements of Policy Objective RH2 of the CDP.
- 7.2.2. I have reviewed the submitted personal documents in this regard, and noting the requirements of Policy Objective RH2, I consider that the applicant has rural links to the area as required and subject to a rural housing residency condition and other policy requirements, I consider the principle of development on the site to be acceptable.

7.3. Design and Amenity

- 7.3.1. I note the appellant has raised issues in relation to the design of the dwelling and that it differs significantly, particularly in alignment and position, by comparison with the existing dwellings to the east. I note that the design and layout is significantly different from the dwellings to the east which have more of a suburban type appearance and which longer elevation sides would face the road. The subject dwelling is designed such that its narrow end would face the road with its longer two storey sides facing the sides including towards the appellant's site to the east.
- 7.3.2. I note the proposed dwelling would have a floor area of 217.5sqm where the site size is 0.266ha which gives rise to a site size requirement of 2175sqm which exceeds the requirements for rural site size under DM Standard 9. I note no concerns in relation to internal floor space standards or in relation to the size of the rear garden which would be more than adequate for private open space provision. I note that the front elevation would be setback by more than the 15m setback required under DM Standard 29.
- 7.3.3. I also note that in relation to the adjacent dwellings, there would be a significant two storey element which would be to the rear of the adjacent building line, per the alignment of the rear elevation of the adjacent dwelling. The appellant has raised concerns in relation to this and in relation to the finished floor levels proposed and site levels. I also note the side elevations would include first floor level windows

facing east and west behind the building line of the adjacent dwelling and in relatively close proximity (predominantly c.11m or greater) to the side garden boundary.

- 7.3.4. I note that the front element would have a FFL of 10.0 and the rear element of 9.0 and I note the drawing submitted in the applicant's appeal response which shows a front section of the proposed development and adjacent house as well as more level details on the site layout plan. I note that as the ground level falls from the front of the site towards the rear, that the rear of the front and rear elements of the house would be somewhat above the adjacent ground levels. Noting that the differences would not be excessive ranging from c.0.15m to up to c.1.5m, I consider that the dwelling would sufficiently follow the ground levels in this regard.
- 7.3.5. I note the site context to the east where the row of rural houses (4 houses in a line over a distance of c.110m and then three houses in a line over a distance of c.93m), have a suburban appearance, in my opinion, given their layout and design. I consider that moving the building line forward to mitigate the impacts I have identified to the rear of the building line would not unduly add to the suburban appearance of the road given that the frontage of the dwelling is narrow so that it would not be particularly prominent.
- 7.3.6. I therefore recommend that in order to reduce the visual impact of the rear element on the adjacent dwelling that, should permission be granted, the building be required to be moved forward by 6m, which is just over half the length the rear element. This and also a requirement to move the dwelling 4m closer to the western boundary, in my view, would result in the dwelling not appearing overbearing when viewed from the adjacent eastern dwelling due to a minimum separation distance above 15m from the main rear side garden boundary. I consider this would enable the dwelling to integrate more into its rural setting without appearing unduly suburban in my view and this would accord with DM Standard 8. I note that the site is of sufficient area in relation to DM Standard 9.
- 7.3.7. Should permission be granted, to avoid excessive overlooking in the rural context, I recommend that the east facing first floor windows in the rear element be required to be in opaque glass. This would be acceptable as the rooms which these windows would serve are a bathroom and a walk-in wardrobe room. Accordingly, I consider that significant overlooking and loss of privacy and residential amenity for the rear

garden to the east would not result. Subject to the above recommended design changes, I consider that the proposed dwelling would visually integrate with the receiving landscape resulting in an excessive urban type appearance relative to the site. I note this in the context of DM Standard 8.

- 7.3.8. I note the appeal has raised issues in relation to the proposed planting scheme which would include tree and hedge planting in close proximity to the boundaries. The trees proposed include silver birch, field maple, mountain ash and emerald queen maple. Beech hedging and Portuguese laurel hedge is also included in the scheme. While I note that the laurel is a non-native species, I do not consider that any significant planning impacts would result on the adjacent dwelling from the planting scheme and that the maintenance and management of such planting is a matter for the applicant in the first instance.
- 7.3.9. I consider the substitution of native species for the laurel to be required to enhance local biodiversity. In my view the integration of the dwelling into the rural site would be further aided by the proposed planting/screening and this should be therefore be required by condition.
- 7.3.10. In relation to the garage, I note it would be located towards the rear of the site. The garage would be 30.5sqm in floor area with a ridge height of c.4.8m and an eaves height of c.2.75m and would be 11.69m in length. Based on these considerations and the positioning of the windows on the western elevation, I consider that it would be visually subservient to the dwelling in terms of size, scale and bulk and that it would not be excessively visually dominant when viewed from the adjacent dwelling to the east and would not result in excessive overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing of adjacent property. In my opinion the garage would accord with DM Standard 6.

7.4. Wastewater Treatment

- 7.4.1. I note the Planner's Report found the proposed tertiary wastewater treatment system to be acceptable. The submitted Site Characterisation Form notes the aquifer type of karst to be regionally important with extreme vulnerability and the soil type to be deep well drained mineral soil. The limestone and calcareous shale bedrock was encountered at a depth of 2.2m in the trial hole. The sub-surface percolation value was noted to be 33. The groundwater protection response is noted to be R2(2). The

report notes the suitability for either a secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter or a tertiary treatment system and infiltration area and proposes the latter be installed with discharge to groundwater.

- 7.4.2. I note the requirements of the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (population equivalent less than or equal to 10). In relation to the Table 6.3 requirement for a minimum depth of 1.2m would be achieved for the tertiary system which would be consistent with Table 6.4 (percolation values) per the sub-surface percolation value noted of 33. I also note that the minimum required separation distances required by Table 6.2 would be achieved. Based on this, I am satisfied that the proposed wastewater treatment system would be in accordance with the standards of the EPA Code and with DM Standard 38 (Effluent Treatment Plants).

7.5. **Other Issues**

- 7.5.1. I note the appeal has raised issues in relation to flood risk asserting that flooding has occurred on the subject site and on their adjacent site to the east in December 2015 and a letter from the OPW suggests some flooding occurred in 2008. However, it is not possible to verify the location of the photos in this regard. I note the Planner's Report noted that the site is not within any mapped flood zone. However, having reviewed the OPW CFRAM flood maps, I note that these do not identify a flood risk. However in relation to the National Indicative Fluvial Mapping, I note that this indicates a flood risk within the site and I note historic flood reports on the Flood Maps website to the south.
- 7.5.2. In this context I consider that a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (SSFRA) would be required to ensure the proposal and its effects would not result in unacceptable levels or increases in flood risk on the site or elsewhere. I note that this would be contrary to DM Standard 68 (Flooding) where a Development Management Justification Test is also required. Based on the information before me I consider that this merits refusing permission. However, as this is a new issue, the Commission may wish to consider if circulation to the parties on this matter is required in advance of any final determination of the appeal.
- 7.5.3. In relation to the proposed vehicular entrance, given the narrow nature of the road in the vicinity of the site and that it runs into a cul de sac within c.175m of the site, such

that I note that, having visited the site, vehicles speeds are extremely low.

Therefore, subject to the conditions recommended by the Transportation section to enhance and maintain sightlines, I consider that the vehicular entrance would be consistent with DM Standard 28 of the CDP and would not result in a traffic hazard.

- 7.5.4. In relation to drainage matters, I note that soakpits are proposed on either side of the dwelling where the ground level would be lower. I note the concerns of the appellants in relation to potential drainage on to their site. The appeal response noted the lower site levels than the adjacent site. Subject to demonstration of no flood risk issues, I consider that the site is of such layout and size relative to the proposed built area as to be capable of ensuring adequate drainage provision.
- 7.5.5. I note that the water supply is proposed from the Killora Lane Group Water Scheme with a letter enclosed confirming connection to same can be facilitated. I consider that no public health issues would arise in relation to water supply.

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 Appropriate Assessment 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.1.01km south-east of Rahasane Turlough SAC, the nearest European site.
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises construction of a house, garage and on site wastewater treatment system. 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.
 - 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.108 m north of the Kilcolgan_040 (IE_WE_29K010600) river waterbody (status “poor”), and is above the GWDTE-Rahasane Turlough (IE_WE_G_0100) waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises one dwelling and a garage.
- 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 compliance with the EPA Code in relation to the on-site wastewater treatment system.

- 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

11.1. I recommend that permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to DM Standard 68 (Flooding) of the Galway County Development Plan 2022 - 2028, the indication that the site is within a flood risk area per the National Indicative Fluvial Mapping and the reports of flooding in the immediate area, in the absence of a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment and a Development Management Justification Test report in accordance with the Flood Risk Management Guidelines (2009), it has not been demonstrated that it would not result in an unacceptable flood risk on the site or surrounding lands. This is contrary to the requirements of DM Standard 68 and would, if permitted, 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

21st January 2026

Appendix 1 – Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500108-GY
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a dwelling, garage and on-site wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Killora, Craughwell, Co. Galway.
	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	PL-500108-GY
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a dwelling, garage and on-site wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Killora, Craughwell, Co. Galway.
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. One new dwelling of total 248sqm on a site area of 0.266ha in a rural 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 rural area includes a line of detached dwellings to the east and agricultural lands otherwise in the vicinity. There is a small forest area close to the south-west and a river c.108m to the south of the site.
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.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)