



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL-500153-MO

---

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Construction of a house, garage and all associated site works. |
| <b>Location</b>                     | Pulgloss, Carrowmore, Louisburgh, Co. Mayo.                    |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Mayo County Council  |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 2560200  |
| <b>Applicant(s)</b>                 | Martin Fox   |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Permission   |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Refuse Permission  |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | First Party Normal Planning Appeal                             |
| <b>Appellant(s)</b>                 | Martin Fox   |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | Paula and Joseph Hall  |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 21 <sup>st</sup> January 2026                                  |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | Sarah O'Mahony   |

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description .....  | 4  |
| 2.0 Proposed Development .....           | 4  |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....    | 5  |
| 3.1. Further Information .....           | 5  |
| 3.2. Decision .....                      | 6  |
| 3.3. Planning Authority Reports .....    | 7  |
| 3.4. Prescribed Bodies .....             | 7  |
| 3.5. Third Party Observations .....      | 8  |
| 4.0 Planning History.....                | 8  |
| 5.0 Policy Context.....                  | 8  |
| 5.1. National Planning Framework.....    | 8  |
| 5.2. Development Plan.....               | 9  |
| 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations ..... | 10 |
| 5.4. EIA Screening .....                 | 10 |
| 6.0 The Appeal .....                     | 11 |
| 6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....             | 11 |
| 6.2. Planning Authority Response.....    | 12 |
| 6.3. Observations.....                   | 12 |
| 7.0 Assessment.....                      | 13 |
| 7.1. Introduction .....                  | 13 |
| 7.2. Local Need.....                     | 13 |
| 7.3. Siting and Design.....              | 15 |
| 7.4. Water Services.....                 | 16 |

8.0 Appropriate Assessment..... 17

9.0 Water Framework Directive ..... 17

10.0 Recommendation ..... 18

Appendix 1 – Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

Appendix 2 – Appropriate Assessment Screening

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.292ha site is situated 2.5km west of Louisburgh in County Mayo in an elevated coastal area on the southern side of Clew Bay. The coast and cliffs are situated 250m north of the site.
- 1.2. The site is accessed from an existing agricultural style laneway from the L58852 local road at the north of the site which is a cul-de-sac accessing residential and agricultural properties.
- 1.3. The site is setback 50m from the road and elevated above it, with a differential of 13m between the road and the site. All the surrounding land form slopes down to the north at the coast.
- 1.4. There are 2no. detached dwellings situated north of the site between it and the road, and another on adjacent property to the west. Land to the east and south comprises agricultural scrub land which rise to a hill behind the site.
- 1.5. No photographs of this site accompany this report due to technical malfunctions.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises:
  - construction of a 138.53m<sup>2</sup> detached, single storey dwelling with a pitched roof and T-shape layout,
  - 33.66m<sup>2</sup> detached, monopitch, domestic garage,
  - Onsite effluent treatment system together,
  - On-site private well and
  - All ancillary site works.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Further Information

3.1.1. The applicant was requested to submit additional documentary evidence to demonstrate compliance with local need policies, the location of the proposed bored well to supply fresh water to the development including yield tests and information regarding the well's construction, and lastly an Archaeological Impact Assessment.

3.1.2. The following advice note was also set out in the further information request letter:

*“Mayo County Council must be satisfied that the applicant ‘Martin Fox’ has a genuine housing need to reside at this location. The applicant is required to comply with one of the categories of housing need of the current Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 as outlined above. The applicant has identified a dwelling granted permission under P03/2824 as the original family home which is no longer in the family ownership. Is the applicant in a position to demonstrate their current social/economic connections to this local area which demonstrates a housing need to reside in the area.”*

3.1.3. The following extract is the applicant's response to item no. 1 regarding local housing need:

*We contend that we have provided sufficient information to show a ‘housing need’ in the initial Planning Submission. We have also included these documents as a part of this Further Information response. We would also like to outline clearly that the applicant lost his original family home, granted Planning Permission under P03/2824 (enclosed), on the adjacent site to the north, during the economic downturn due to financial distress. Section 2.13 (d) of the Mayo County Development Plan, Development Management Standards, states that the “...the occupancy clause condition shall not affect the sale of a dwelling where force majeure applies.” Therefore, we contend that the applicant is from the area, supported by the enclosed Land Registry documents, and has a genuine housing need as discussed at the Planning Clinic. Martin has reestablished himself following financial and relationship distress and current Government Policy is to apply the ‘Fresh Start Principle’ to divorced and separated people, reflected in schemes like the Local*

*Authority led Affordable Purchase Scheme and the 'First Home Shared Equity Scheme'.*

- 3.1.4. The documents referred to above comprise land registry details demonstrating the applicant's ownership of the dwelling to the north of the site from 2006-2015 as well as a copy of the relevant grant of planning permission for that dwelling.
- 3.1.5. With regard to the proposed well the applicant submitted chemical analysis, yield results, designs for the proposed construction of the well and its proposed location on a revised site layout plan.
- 3.1.6. An Archaeological Impact Assessment was submitted which noted the location of the site partially within the SMR zone of a fulacht fia and a ringfort-cashel both to the northeast of the site. The report noted there is actually a pair of fulachta fiadh and both are situated 20.5m outside of the subject site. The walkover survey of the proposed development site revealed no features of archaeological significance and concluded that the proposed development would have no impact on the identified recorded monuments. No mitigation is proposed.

### 3.2. **Decision**

Mayo County Council issued a decision to refuse permission on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025 for one reason as follows:

1. The proposed development is located in an area identified as being under strong urban influence for development as set out in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028. Under Objective RHO1 the council may only permit permanent housing needs in these such areas where the applicants have established such a housing need. In this regard, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the applicant has a permanent housing need at this location in accordance with Objective RHO1. It is considered that the proposed development, if granted, would constitute haphazard development in a rural area, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment, would lead to demands for the uneconomic provision of public services and communal facilities, would contribute to the erosion of the visual and environmental amenity of the area, and therefore would interfere with the character of the landscape at this

location which it is necessary to preserve. Therefore, the proposed development would materially contravene the rural housing policies and objectives of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

### **3.3. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.3.1. Planning Reports**

- There are two Case Planner's reports on the file, one recommending further information and the latter assessing the response.
- The Case Planner's report recommendation to refuse permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues were screened out. Environmental Impact Assessment was not discussed.
- It notes the applicant's further information response but concluded that the applicant has not clearly demonstrated a social or economic link to the area.

#### **3.3.2. Other Technical Reports**

- Area Engineer: No response received.
- Water Services: No response received.
- Archaeology Section: One report received recommending further information.

### **3.4. Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Éireann: No response received.
- An Taisce: No response received.
- Development Applications Unit: No response received.
- Fáilte Ireland: No response received.
- The Heritage Council: No response received.

### 3.5. Third Party Observations

One third party submission was received from Paula and Joseph Hall raising the following matters:

- Impact to water supply and existing third party well immediately north of the proposed development area, west of the access lane. The proposed septic tank is situated uphill of the existing well and therefore there is a risk of contamination. There is also a concern set out regarding water pressure and overdevelopment of the water table.
- Overlooking to dwelling to the north. The existing mound/berm would be removed and proposed trees would not provide privacy and screening for many years due to the exposed nature of the area.
- Overconcentration of wells and septic tanks in the area.
- Insufficient demonstration of local housing need and inaccurate information submitted by the applicant.

### 4.0 Planning History

- P03/2824: Planning permission granted to Martin Fox to construct a dwelling.

### 5.0 Policy Context

#### 5.1. National Planning Framework

- 5.1.1. The National Planning Framework (NPF) was revised in April 2025 and is the Government's high-level strategic plan for shaping the future growth and development of our country out to the year 2040.
- 5.1.2. National Policy Objective 28 refers to the development of single dwellings in the rural area as follows:

*Ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:*

- *In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements;*
- *In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.*

## 5.2. Development Plan

- 5.2.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). Map 3.1 highlights the sites location within a rural area under strong urban influence.
- 5.2.2. Map 10.1 identifies landscape policy units throughout the county. It outlines how the landscape in which the site is situated is classed as 'Policy Area 3' which refers to uplands, moors, heaths or bogs. The site is not visible or accessed from a scenic route.
- 5.2.3. The following policies and objectives are of particular note:
- RHO 1 seeks to facilitate housing in the rural area, however in rural areas under urban influence applicants will be required to demonstrate a social or economic link to the area in which they wish to build and defines an economic need as applicants having a genuine housing need and whose future or current employment is in close proximity to the primary residence they propose to build. It provides a list of categories of applicants comprising farmers, their relatives, returning immigrants, persons employed in local enterprises and health circumstances.
  - RHO 4: Housing applications, within Mayo's Coastal Areas and Lakeshores and within areas along scenic routes with designated scenic views, will be considered where the applicants can demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:

- Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area
- Cannot be considered at an alternative location
- Meets high standards in siting and design
- Satisfies all other criteria with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety, and environmental considerations
- Demonstrates enhancement to local landscape character and ecological connectivity

Note: An occupancy clause will be attached to any grant of planning permission.

- NEO 26: consider applications for development, within Mayo's Coastal Areas and Lakeshores and within areas along scenic routes with designated scenic views, that can demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:

- Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area.
- Cannot be considered at an alternative location.
- Meets high standards in siting and design.
- Contributes to and enhances local landscape character.
- Satisfies all other criteria, with regard to, inter alia, servicing, public safety and environmental considerations.

Rural housing applications along Coastal Areas and Lakeshores must comply with the requirements set out in Objective RHO 4 (Chapter 3).

### 5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. West Connaught Coast Special Area of Conservation is situated 300m north of the site. Cloghmoyle Dunes proposed Natural Heritage Area is situated 1.2km northeast of the site.

### 5.4. EIA Screening

- 5.4.1. 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.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

6.1.1. One first party appeal was received which raised the following grounds of appeal:

- The proposed design and siting was presented to the Planning Authority to their satisfaction. Test results for proposed services also exceeded the relevant requirements.
- There is an unwritten policy in place in Mayo County Council by direction of the Senior Planner that an applicant may only construct one rural dwelling. This is not reflected in the CDP and is subjective and unfounded in planning legislation. Discussions held regarding this matter in a pre-planning clinic suggested it would be difficult to demonstrate a housing need for the applicant. This Planning Authority undertakes assessments from a negative perspective instead of finding any positive aspects.
- The applicant resided in the dwelling with his spouse from 2005-2015 after obtaining planning permission to construct it. A copy of the grant of permission and land registry details are submitted. The dwelling was repossessed and sold in the economic downturn.
- The decision followed a preformed format regarding haphazard development and preservation of the rural environment – issues which were never previously raised. The Planning Authority did not specify what documentation would be suitable to demonstrate a housing need and subsequent discussions indicated that no level of further information would have altered the recommendation. This demonstrates a pre-determined position inconsistent with the principles of fair and objective assessment as required under Section 34 of the Planning and Development Act.

- The applicant meets the criteria as a returning immigrant under policy objective RHO 1(3) as he wishes to retire to where the family home was in order to be close to his daughter following a divorce.
- The proposed development would support the local community and established public services.
- Recent case law regarding a rural dwelling in Fingal County Council's functional area is applicable which refers to a national housing crises as well as 'Objective 19' from the 'National Development Plan' which seeks to facilitate the provision of housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstratable economic or social need.
- Previous iterations of the Mayo CDP stated a social connection to the area was established if an applicant resided in the area for a minimum of five years.

## 6.2. Planning Authority Response

None

## 6.3. Observations

6.3.1. One third party observation was received from Paula and Joseph Hall which raised the following issues:

- The applicant has no genuine local housing need for this area.
- The applicant has incorrectly provided his current address as Pulgloss. The observation states '*to the best of our knowledge and that of our neighbours, he does not currently live on the road*'. Land registry details submitted with the application list the applicant's address in County Galway at the time of owning the observer's property at the north of the site.
- The applicant claims to have resided in the observer's dwelling for 10 years before it was repossessed. Local knowledge from long-term residents suggest it was rented during that period and not occupied by the applicant.
- The observer's dwelling had an insufficient water source at the time they purchased it as a well in the area was shared by two other dwellings and

necessitated the boring of a new private well for the observer's property. Three attempts were made to bore the well before a suitable water source was found. This, together with the presence of 7no. private well and septic tank serviced dwellings on the same laneway demonstrates that water availability is limited and the groundwater table is already under pressure. Adding another well and percolation area could increase the risk of contamination and reduce supply for existing properties.

- The elevated and sloping nature of the site requires excavation which would increase run-off affecting the observer's property. No detailed drainage plan has been submitted.
- The main living area of the observer's property is on the first floor facing south towards the subject site. The proposed dwelling would result in overlooking and proposed tree planting would not provide meaningful screening for many years in this exposed coastal environment.

## 7.0 **Assessment**

### 7.1. **Introduction**

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the only substantive issues in this appeal to be considered is the principle of development are as follows:

- Local Need
- Siting and Design
- Water Services

### 7.2. **Local Need**

7.2.1. The site is situated in a rural area under strong urban influence and therefore Objective RHO 1 requires applicants to demonstrate a social or economic link to the area in which they wish to build. Further, as the site is situated in a coastal area RHO 4 applies which again requires applicants to demonstrate a long-standing

social link to the area concerned and similarly NEO 26 also requires applications for development, within Mayo's Coastal Areas to demonstrate a long-standing social link to the area concerned.

- 7.2.2. During the course of the original planning application submission, the further information response and the first party appeal, the applicant submitted the same two pieces of documentary evidence three times to demonstrate compliance with these policies: a copy of a grant of planning permission for a dwelling adjacent to the subject site which is now owned and occupied by a third party, and land registry details regarding that dwelling demonstrating the applicant's ownership of that dwelling from 2006-2015. The applicant has not submitted any evidence to support his claim of occupying that dwelling during the timeframe in question or any other residence in the area. Such documentary evidence commonly includes address records and supporting letters from local organisations like sports and community groups etc however no such information was submitted.
- 7.2.3. It is important to highlight at this juncture that unfortunately ownership of a property does not confer its occupation by the landowner and I consider this to be insufficient to demonstrate that the applicant resided in the area for any period of time. In my view the applicant has failed to submit any documentary evidence of residing in the rural area, despite claims of occupying an adjacent dwelling for a period of ten years. In this regard the application documents do not demonstrate that the applicant has a social or economic link to this rural area and therefore does not meet the requirements of RHO 1, RHO 4 and NEO 26.
- 7.2.4. I note that the appeal makes reference to older Mayo County Development Plans which have been superceded and are irrelevant in this case as an application can only be assessed against the policy in place at the time of its making. The relevant CDP policy has been discussed above.
- 7.2.5. The appeal also references the National Development Plan however this is the Government's fiscal strategy for the coming years and does not set out policies or objectives regarding rural dwellings. National Planning Objective 28 of the National Planning Framework however supports the provision of single dwellings in rural areas under rural influence, but only in circumstances based on *'the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and*

*siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans*'. The applicant has demonstrated ownership of a rural dwelling but has not demonstrated that he lived in that dwelling or in the surrounding rural area and therefore the proposed development does not meet the requirements of NPO 28.

### 7.3. **Siting and Design**

- 7.3.1. The site is situated in a coastal and sensitive setting however it benefits from an existing entrance and laneway. Having driven the road and viewed the site from multiple aspects I note that it is clustered together with adjacent dwellings and repeats a pattern seen at the west in being situated to the rear of a dwelling further down the slope and adjacent another dwelling on the higher reaches of the slope. In this context I consider the site has infill qualities and constitutes backland development. There is however no policy or development management standard in the CDP regarding backland development and therefore it will be assessed on its own merits.
- 7.3.2. In terms of settlement patterns, the dwelling would be clustered close to existing dwellings and the use of an existing access point is a positive aspect. It would be situated on higher ground than the road however its set back and position to the rear of another dwelling means it would have little visibility from the public arena. The site is situated close to the coast with no opposing road or views achievable from across the bay due to the significant distance. Some cut and fill will be required in order to accommodate the footprint of the single storey dwelling however I consider the degree of landscape manipulation would not significantly alter the character of the landscape given the extent of existing dwellings immediately adjacent to the site.
- 7.3.3. I note the third-party observation raises concerns regarding overlooking to the main living space which is stated to be situated on the first floor at the rear of the dwelling, facing the subject site. I note there would be a separation distance of 52m between the two rear elevations and in this regard I consider any overlooking exacerbated by the ground level difference would be mitigated by the separation distance in the bare earth scenario. I agree with the observer that proposed landscaping would likely be slow to fully establish due to the exposed location of the site, however in the interim I do not consider that the privacy and residential amenity of the observer's property

would be significantly impacted by the design and layout of the proposed development.

- 7.3.4. I therefore consider the design and layout of the single storey dwelling is acceptable for the site.

#### 7.4. **Water Services**

- 7.4.1. The observer raised concerns regarding contamination of the local water supply as well as security of supply from private wells. This matter was raised during the application stage also and the applicant submitted yield test results and laboratory chemical analysis results as part of the further information response. All results suggest that the proposed water supply is acceptable in terms of quality and quantity.
- 7.4.2. A revised site layout plan was also submitted which demonstrated that all required separation distances were met for the proposed well and wastewater treatment system within the site however the location of wells and wastewater treatment systems for adjoining properties are not illustrated and therefore it is unclear if separation distances are met, particularly as the proposed percolation area will have a separation distance of only 3-3.5m from adjoining residential properties.
- 7.4.3. I note this would represent a new issue and that the third party observation was not circulated. However in light of the more substantive reason for refusal set out above, I do not recommend initiating Section 131 of the Planning and Development Act 200, as amended and seeking clarification from the applicant as to the location of adjoining wastewater treatment systems.
- 7.4.4. In terms of the cumulative density and concentration of private systems in the area, I note Section 5.4.1 of the EPA CoP which states '*Densities of DWWTS greater than six per hectare in areas of 'extreme' or 'high' groundwater vulnerability may mean a negative effect on groundwater quality.*' The subject site and surrounding area is situated in an area with a vulnerability rating of 'X' due to the location of rock close or at the surface. It does not however have that high a density of dwellings within 1ha and therefore, notwithstanding matters regarding separation distances, I am satisfied that the density of treatment systems is not likely to impact groundwater supplies.

7.4.5. Lastly, I note the observation raises concerns regarding drainage and surface water run off potentially affecting the observer's dwelling to the north due to the elevated and sloping nature of the site. The location of a soakway is illustrated on the site layout plan in the southeast corner of the site which, in my view, is appropriate to cater to surface water run off from the dwelling. In the event of a grant of planning permission, it may be appropriate to require the preparation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan in order to ensure acceptable construction management techniques are enacted to protect adjacent property.

## 8.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

### 8.1. Screening Determination

#### **Finding of no likely significant effects**

8.1.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Inishmore Island SAC in view of the conservation objectives of this/ these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

8.1.2. This determination is based on:

- The scale and nature of works,
- The location of the site outside of the SAC and with no direct connectivity to any protected habitats.
- The attributes and targets associated with the conservation objectives of the site which focus on artificial barriers affecting access to suitable habitats and disturbance from human activity.

## 9.0 **Water Framework Directive**

### 9.1. Introduction

9.1.1. The site is situated in the Erriff-Clew Bay catchment area and Carrownisky sub-catchment. Clew bay is a coastal water body situated 250m north of the site. The

Aghany stream is situated 15m to the north. The underlying groundwater body is the Clifden-Castlebar bedrock aquifer which is categorised as poorly productive bedrock. Soils are classed as poorly draining while the subsoils are noted to have a vulnerability rating of 'X' as they contain rock close to or at the surface.

## 9.2. Assessment

9.2.1. 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 & 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.

9.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The domestic nature and scale of the works.
- The location of the site in relation to nearby waterbodies,
- The proposed new wastewater treatment system in compliance with the EPA CoP 2021.

## 9.4. Conclusion

9.4.1. I conclude 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

10.1. I recommend that planning permission is refused in accordance with the following reason:

1. Rural Housing Objective RHO 1 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 requires applicants seeking to construct single dwellings in rural areas

under urban influence to demonstrate a social or economic link to the area in which they wish to build. Rural Housing Objective 4 and Natural Environment Objective 26 require a social link to be demonstrated for housing development in coastal areas, while National Policy Objective 28 of the National Planning Framework seeks to facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area. Having regard to the documentation submitted with the application and appeal which demonstrates the applicant's previous ownership of a dwelling in the nearby rural area but which has not demonstrated occupation or residence in the rural area, a social or economic link to the rural area has not been established. The proposed development would therefore contravene objectives RHO 1, RHO 4 and NEO 26 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and NPO 28 of the National Planning Framework and 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.

---

Sarah O'Mahony

25<sup>th</sup> February 2025

**Appendix 1 - Form 1**  
**EIA Pre-Screening**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Case Reference   | PL-500153-MO   |
| Proposed Development<br>Summary  | Construction of a detached dwelling, garage, on-site wastewater treatment system, new water well and revised vehicular arrangements.       |
| Development Address  | Pulgloss, Carrowmore, Louisburgh, Co. Mayo   |
|  | 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?<br><br>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:<br><br>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,<br><br>- 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.<br><br><input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required. |
| 2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u> , Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><br>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.   | State the Class here   |
| <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 development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.<br>No Screening required.         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required   |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.<br>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)<br>OR<br>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required) | Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units<br><br>Threshold = 500 units<br>Proposal = 1 unit |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>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)?</b> |   |
| <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>   | <b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>                 |
| <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   | <b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> |

## Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

| <b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Characteristics of proposed development</b></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 rural site is unserviced and its size is not exceptional in the context of the prevailing plot size in the area for rural dwellings in the area.</p> <p>A short-term construction phase would be required and 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. The development, by virtue of its type and nature, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. Its operation presents no significant risks to human health.</p> <p>The size and scale of the proposed development is not significantly or exceptionally different to the existing dwellings.</p> |
| <p><b>Location of development</b></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,</p> | <p>The development is situated in a rural area adjacent to and in close proximity to existing residential properties which is not exceptional in the context of surrounding development.</p> <p>It is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects.</p> <p>The development is situated within a high sensitivity landscape and also close to recorded archaeological monuments however no significant</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).   | impacts are predicted and these matters are addressed above.  |
| <b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b><br>(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 nature of the proposed development and works constituting development within an existing built up area, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act. |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  |   |
| <b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>   | <b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>   |
| <b>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>  | EIA is not required.  |

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

**Appendix 2 - AA Screening Determination  
Test for likely significant effects**

| Screening for Appropriate Assessment<br>Test for likely significant effects   |  |  |   |   |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>  |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Brief description of project</b>   |  | Construction of a detached dwelling, garage, on-site wastewater treatment system, new water well and revised vehicular arrangements.   |   |   |
| <b>Brief description of development characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</b>   |  | Elevated greenfield site situated adjacent to existing dwellings with existing agricultural laneway. West Connaught Coast Special Area of Conservation is situated 300m north of the site and could potentially be impacted by surface water and ground water contamination. |   |   |
| <b>Screening report</b>   |  | Yes, prepared by Sitecheck.  |   |   |
| <b>Natura Impact Statement</b>  |  | No   |   |   |
| <b>Relevant submissions</b>   |  | No   |   |   |
| <b>Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model</b>  |  |  |   |   |
| European Site (code)  | Qualifying interests <sup>1</sup><br>Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)  | Distance from proposed development (km)  | Ecological connections <sup>2</sup>   | Consider further in screening <sup>3</sup><br>Y/N |
| West Connaught Coast Area of Conservation<br>002998   | Tursiops truncatus (Common Bottlenose Dolphin) [1349]<br>Phocoena phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351]<br><br>NPWS website accessed 25 <sup>th</sup> February 2026 | 300m   | Indirect hydrological via surface water during construction stage and wastewater discharge to groundwater during operational stage. | Yes   |
| <sup>1</sup> Summary description / <b>cross reference to NPWS website</b> is acceptable at this stage in the report<br><sup>2</sup> Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species<br><sup>3</sup> if no connections: N |  |  |   |   |
| <b>Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites</b>   |  |  |   |   |

[From the AA Screening Report or the Inspector's own assessment if no Screening Report submitted, complete the following table where European sites need further consideration taking the following into account:

- (a) Identify potential direct or indirect impacts (if any) arising from the project alone that could have an effect on the European Site(s) taking into account the size and scale of the proposed development and all relevant stages of the project (See Appendix 9 in Advice note 1A).
- (b) Are there any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water, wastewater etc. that would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site?
- (c) Identify possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects)

**AA Screening matrix**

| Site name<br>Qualifying interests   | Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*   |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | Impacts  | Effects  |
| West Connaught Coast Area of Conservation<br>002998<br><br>Tursiops truncatus (Common Bottlenose Dolphin) [1349]<br>Phocoena phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351] | <p><b>Direct:</b><br/>None</p> <p><b>Indirect:</b><br/>Negative impacts on surface water/water quality due to temporary construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution.</p> <p>Operational stage discharges to groundwater.</p> | None – the attributes for both conservation objectives refer to access to suitable habitats and disturbance, neither of which are likely to occur as a result of the proposed development. No artificial barriers would be introduced and human activity is sufficiently removed from the SAC to ensure disturbance would not occur. |
| <b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone):</b>   | No.  |  |
| <b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b>   | No.  |  |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*</b> | No. |
|---|-----|

**Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site**

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Inishmore Island SAC. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.

No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

**Screening Determination**

**Finding of no likely significant effects**

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the West Connaught Coast SAC in view of the conservation objectives of this/ these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The scale and nature of works,
- The location of the site outside of the SAC and with no direct connectivity to any protected habitats.
- The attributes and targets associated with the conservation objectives of the site which focus on artificial barriers affecting access to suitable habitats and disturbance from human activity.

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