



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500257-MO-25

Development	Construction of a house and garage with treatment plant and percolation area together with associated site works.
Location	Caher, Kiltimagh, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560460.
Applicant(s)	Padraic Dempsey.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission.
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal.
Appellant(s)	Raphael McCarron, John McDermott, Debbie Cutler, Raymond and Liz Scurr; and James Costello.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	5 th February 2026.
Inspector	C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.288ha., in the rural townland of Caher consists of the majority of an agricultural grass field which slopes somewhat downhill away from the adjacent local laneway. The immediate area of the site and surroundings are elevated in the local landscape. The local road serving the site is a single lane relatively narrow laneway. The field boundaries consist of hedgerow and stone walls and there is an existing agricultural entrance. An overhead wire traverses the front edge of the site.
- 1.2. There is a detached bungalow dwelling directly opposite to the north and a thatched cottage opposite to the north-east. The rural site is c.4.5km south-west of the village of Kilkelly and is c.5.3km east of the town of Kiltimagh and is accessed via a local road a short distance north of the R322.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Construction of a single storey pitched roof dwelling of 168.3sqm and pitched roof domestic garage of 32sq.m
 - On-site wastewater treatment system.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Mayo County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to an assessment under Article 6 of the EU Habitats Directive given the proximity (c.10m) to the River Moy SAC and a revised site layout plan indicating the finished floor level of the dwelling directly opposite. It also noted concerns in relation to the scale of the house with a request to address the ridge height (maximum ridge height of 6.5m), a maximum depth of 8.5m and in relation to the scale of the porch.

Following F.I. it was decided to grant permission subject to 16 no. conditions.

Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2 requires the prior submission for agreement of revised plans addressing the roof profile regarding the height of the ridge and showing a maximum depth of 8.5m.
- Condition no. 3 requires the finished floor level of the dwelling to be as shown on the site layout plan submitted at F.I. stage.
- Condition no. 4 requires the prior submission of details of the external materials.
- Condition no. 9 limits the height of the any new boundary wall to 1.2m and at the roadside shall be a minimum of 3.5m from the nearside edge of the carriageway.
- Condition no. 13 requires the retention of all existing trees/ hedgerows on the site save at the house location or in relation to sightlines and that additional screen planting of native deciduous trees shall be planted along the site boundaries except at the site entrance.
- Condition no. 14 requires that the garage shall be used only as a private domestic shed.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The initial Planner's Report noted the proximity of the River Moy SAC c.10m to the south of the site boundary and that no AA Screening Report was submitted. It noted the third party concerns in relation to impacts on groundwater such that it considered it necessary to request a screening report. The report noted, given the site location in an area classified as a category 2 remaining rural area and not within a designated scenic route, that there is no requirement to demonstrate housing need.

In relation to the design and siting of the proposed dwelling, it noted concerns in relation to the ridge height, depth of the dwelling and in relation to the FFL. It noted sightlines of 70m would be achieved in both directions with no concerns subject to

conditions. It noted the wastewater treatment system and stated that determining the site's suitability required the submission of an AA screening report. It noted that the site is not located within a flood zone. Further information was recommended to be requested.

The second Planner's Report noted the AA Screening Report which noted no pathways from the site to the Glone River (part of the SAC) and having assessed the report it was satisfied that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the River Moy SAC. The report noted that the design of the dwelling remains unchanged and that should permission be granted, and having regard to policy RHP 5, a revised proposal for a reduced plan depth be required. It recommended that permission be granted subject to 16 no. conditions.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer: No objection subject to condition.
- Road Design: No objection subject to condition.
- Environment – Flood Risk: No further flood risk assessment required.
- Water Services: No report received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

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

3.4. Third Party Observations

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

- The house will obscure the view over the landscape.
- The existing houses are all on the left hand side of the laneway and tucked into the hillside.

- There is a risk to groundwater from the wastewater treatment system and issues in relation to the dates the trial holes were dug not correctly stated.
- The laneway is too narrow for the extra congestion.
- Noise pollution will result.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

051420: Permission granted by the P.A. for a dwelling house, septic tank and percolation area.

Sites in the Vicinity

063642: Permission granted by the P.A. at site opposite to the north for retention of septic tank and percolation areas.

041671: Permission granted by the P.A. at site c.15m to the east for dwelling house and wastewater treatment system. Not implemented.

5.0 Policy Context

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

Volume 1

Chapter 2 – Core and Settlement Strategy

SO 9 Ecological Impact Assessment, Appropriate Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

To ensure the assessment of all planning applications in the Plan area have regard to the information, data and requirements of the Appropriate Assessment Natura Impact Report, SEA Environmental Report and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report contained in Volume 5 of the Mayo CDP 2022-2028.

Chapter 3 – Housing

Section 3.4.8 Rural Single Housing

Per Map 3.1, the site is not located within a rural area under strong urban influence. The site location is within Category 2 Remaining Rural Area and not within a designated scenic route such that there is no requirement to demonstrate a rural housing need.

Policy RHP 1 To support and promote strong vibrant sustainable rural communities in County Mayo.

Policy RHP 2 To support the development of all rural areas to regain sustainability and vibrancy and to reverse the significant rural population decline since 1951.

Policy RHP 5 To ensure that rural housing applications employ site specific design solutions to provide for proposals that integrate into and reflect and enhance local landscape character, in terms of siting, design, materials, finishes and landscaping.

Objective RHO 2 In rural areas not classified as in Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence, there is a presumption in favour of facilitating the provision of single housing in the countryside, based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, except in the case of single houses seeking to locate along Mayo's Scenic Routes/Scenic Routes with Scenic Views or Coastal Areas/Lakeshores (See RHO 3 below).

Objective RHO 5 To advise all rural housing applicants to utilise the Design Guidelines for Rural Housing (Mayo County Council) and core principles of same.

Chapter 10 – Natural Environment

Per Map 10.1 the site is within Landscape Policy Area 4 where rural dwellings are deemed to have a low potential to create adverse impacts on the existing landscape character.

Objective NEO 11

To ensure that the impact of development within or adjacent to national designated sites, Natural Heritage Areas, Ramsar Sites and Nature Reserves likely to result in significant adverse effects on the designated site is assessed by requiring the submission of an Ecological Impact Assessment report (EclA), Environmental Report (ER), an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR), if deemed necessary, and/or a Natura Impact Assessment (NIS), if deemed necessary, prepared by a suitably qualified professional, which should accompany planning applications.

Objective NEO 25

To consider applications for development, along Mayo's Scenic routes, that can demonstrate a clear need to locate in the area concerned, whilst ensuring that it:

- *Does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of the area.*
- *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 Scenic Routes must comply with the requirements set out in Objective RHO 3 (Chapter 3).*

Policy NEP 14

To protect, enhance and contribute to the physical, visual and scenic character of County Mayo and to preserve its unique landscape character.

Policy NEP 21

To manage, protect and enhance surface water and ground water quality to meet the requirements of the Water Framework Directive.

Objective NEO 27

To ensure all development proposals are consistent with the Landscape Appraisal of County Mayo and the associated Landscape Sensitivity Matrix and future editions thereof.

Volume 2

Section 2.3 Site Size

Table 1 Site Size Requirements – New Build 3,000sqm (min width 40m) for coastal / lakeshore / beaches.

Section 2.8 Rural Housing Garages / Sheds

Rural Housing Garages / Sheds shall:

- *In general, be subordinate to the existing dwelling in its size, unless in exceptional cases, a larger garage / shed compliments the existing dwelling in its design and massing.*
- *Not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties through undue overlooking, undue overshadowing and/or an over dominant visual impact.*
- *Carefully consider site coverage to avoid unacceptable loss of private open space.*

Section 2.10 Effluent Treatment Systems – This requires, inter alia, a site suitability assessment for rural dwellings in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses.

Section 2.11 relates to water supply.

Section 2.12 relates to surface water.

Section 7.6 relates to access visibility requirements where 70m sightlines are required per Table 4.

Section 8.4 Effluent Treatment Systems provides that the suitability of a site shall be determined in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice for single houses.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.10m north the River Moy SAC (site code 002298).
- c.7.3km north-west of Mannin and Island Lakes PNHA (site code 001910).
- c.8.1km south of Killaturly Turlough PNHA (site code 000511).
- c.8.5km west of Urlaur Lakes SAC and PNHA (site code 001571).
- c.9.5km south-west of Lough Gower PNHA (site code 000523).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal submitted by Raphael McCarron, John McDermott, Debbie Cutler, Raymond and Liz Scurr; and James Costello can be summarised as follows:

- The existing farm settlements on Caher Hill all nestle into the landscape.
- The laneway is narrow and in poor condition with no opportunities for vehicles coming in opposite directions to pass.
- Residents continue to farm and there are three other farmers who access their land via the laneway such that there are multiple vehicle and animal movements along the laneway.
- The increased car numbers will result in excessive congestion on the laneway.
- There has been no safety assessment for heavy machinery on the laneway including for those who use it. Multiple visits will do serious damage to the laneway as evidenced by the submitted photos from one visit in July.
- Refuse lorries will not use the hill with bins brought down to the junction of the L5904 and the R322.
- The dwelling design is of excessive scale, width, depth and height and the FFL will be only 300mm below the level of Yellow Cottage opposite and it will be higher than this cottage.
- The large front (north) facing windows are out of keeping with other cottages on the hill and will invade the privacy of the houses opposite.
- The new dwelling at over 19m in width, with no break in form, is contrary to the Mayo rural design guidelines 2008 and the modern urban form will be out of character with the neighbouring cottages and visually dominant.
- The dwelling will block views from the house opposite which has unspoilt views out towards Caher and beyond to Knock since 1939.
- The driveway appears to be of non-porous material and this could drain on to the laneway.
- The house with 4 double bedrooms could potentially double the population on the laneway with each house having one or two inhabitants.
- The conditions do not include any occupancy clause.

- Groundwater pollution concerns from the wastewater treatment system in close proximity to the Glore River, which floods, and the River Moy SAC.
- There has been no consultation in relation to the future maintenance of the laneway.
- The development will have a detrimental impact on the local community.
- 3D views of proposed dwelling attached, photos of Yellow Cottage and pre-famine cottage and hilltop cottage attached, photo of oldest living resident farming, photo of local farmer moving his sheep down the laneway, photo of damage to laneway from July, photo from October showing current state of the laneway and photo showing poor visibility on the laneway.

6.2. Applicant Response

None received.

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
- Traffic and Access
- Wastewater Treatment
- Other Matters

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. I note the site is not located within an area under urban influence and that outside of such areas and outside of designated scenic routes there is no CDP policy

requirement to demonstrate a rural housing need. While I have no concerns regarding the principle of a residential dwelling on this rural site in the Category Remaining Rural Area, I note other assessments are required as below.

7.3. Design

- 7.3.1. I note the appellants have raised issues in relation to the design of the dwelling which they consider to be excessive for the site. I note that the dwelling would be 16.5m back from the road at FFL 99.9 and it would be in a relatively prominent elevated position when viewed from the south. The Yellow Cottage dwelling opposite is at 100.2 FFL. I note the ridge height, at 7.23m, would be c.2.5 times the eaves height which would be c.2.9m. The dwelling would also be 19.3m wide with no variation in the front or rear form to break up what I consider would be a relatively wide form with no significant front or rear design variation. I note the depth would be c.9.8m which would provide for a general depth of two rooms.
- 7.3.2. I note that Policy RHP 5 of the CDP seeks site specific designs to integrate and reflect the local landscape character. I note Policy Objective RHO 5 advises applicants to utilise the Design Guidelines for Rural Housing (Mayo County Council) and the core principles of same. In this regard, I note the dwelling would be sited relatively uphill on the site and there is an absence of design measures to reduce the visual massing.
- 7.3.3. Given its prominent position in the landscape, significant massing and modern wide window proportions, in my opinion it would not reflect the scale, form and proportions of the older traditional vernacular architecture of the immediate area which includes a number of traditional cottages. I also consider that the volume/massing of the roof would be excessive which is partly a result of the excessive two room depth of the dwelling.
- 7.3.4. Based on the above, I consider that the position and design of the dwelling on the site fails to utilise the Mayo rural housing design guidelines as required by Objective RHO 5. I also consider that, primarily due to the excessive scale and massing of the dwelling, there has been a failure to employ a site specific design that would integrate with and reflect the local landscape character. In my opinion the dwelling

would be unduly visually prominent in the rural landscape notwithstanding the tree planting shown on the boundaries of the updated site layout plan.

7.3.5. In my opinion the position and design of the proposed dwelling would be contrary to Policy RHP 5 of the Development Plan. I note that the applicant was requested to address the scale and proportions of the dwelling at F.I. stage and declined to amend the design. I am not satisfied that the scale and massing can be appropriately conditioned out of the design to ameliorate the effects I have noted above. Accordingly, I recommend that permission be refused in relation to these matters. To note, I have no significant issues in relation to the external materials proposed, including a mix of stone, render and standard slates, which could be conditioned for agreement with the P.A. should permission be granted.

7.3.6. I note the garage would be located to the rear east side of the dwelling at FFL 99.5 and I consider that it would be subservient in scale and form to the dwelling and would be consistent with Section 2.8 (Rural Housing Garages/Sheds) policy. Should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to ensure its use only for purposes ancillary to the use of the dwelling.

7.4. Traffic and Access

7.4.1. I note the appellants have raised issues in relation to the limited width of the laneway leading to the site from the junction of the L5904 and the R322. The proposed site entrance would be located c.150m uphill from this junction along the single lane local road. I note that the Council's Road Design section had no issues with the development. However, based on the narrow width and steep nature of the road in parts leading up to the site, I consider this laneway, which serves a number of other dwellings and farms, with no pull-in points for vehicles travelling in opposite directions, to be inadequate to cater for even a modest intensification of development that would occur in relation to vehicular access.

7.4.2. I note this given the significant distance back to the junction where a vehicle could have to reverse to, noting the four farm dwellings on the laneway and that the appellants have advised three other farms have their access via the laneway. In this context, I consider that any further increase in development on the current laneway would give rise to significant obstructions and traffic hazards. This would endanger

public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and obstruction of road users or otherwise such that I recommend permission be refused.

- 7.4.3. In relation to sightlines, I note the limited width of the laneway is such that speeds on it are very low. I note 70m sightlines have been demonstrated in both directions from the proposed entrance and that the P.A. had no issue subject to conditions related to the vehicular entrance.

7.5. **Wastewater Treatment**

- 7.5.1. I note per the submitted Site Characterisation Form that the locally important aquifer has a vulnerability which is rated as moderate. The bedrock is noted to be Dinantian Mixed Sandstones, Shales and Limestones. The sediment type is noted to be till derived from Devonian and carboniferous sandstones. The form notes the groundwater protection response to be R1. The depth of the trial hole is noted to be 2m with topsoil encountered followed by silt/sand and then silt/gravel.
- 7.5.2. The sub-surface percolation value was noted to be 12 and the surface percolation value is noted to be 10. Based on this, the report recommends a secondary treatment system and infiltration area and that to achieve an unsaturated soil depth between the invert of the percolation trench and the bedrock of at least 1.2m the percolation area should be raised by 0.5m. The relevant criteria for assessment of this is the EPA Code of Practice (2021) for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (P.E. <10).
- 7.5.3. I note that per Table 6.4 given the percolation values, the proposed secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter is suitable. I note that the required minimum separation distances of Table 6.2 would be met. In relation to Table 6.3 of the EPA Code, for a groundwater protection response of R1, I note the minimum depth required is 0.9m and that this would be met given the 1.2m depth proposed.
- 7.5.4. Based on this, I conclude that the wastewater would be safely disposed of the site consistent with Section 2.10 Effluent Treatment Systems of Volume 2 of the CDP. Should permission be granted, I recommend a standard condition to require adherence to the EPA Code of Practice.

7.6. Other Matters

- 7.6.1. I note objections in relation to the potential for surface water to drain on to the road. I note there would be a soakpit in the rear garden area. Should permission be granted I recommend a standard condition to ensure SUDS methods are employed so that surface water drainage is catered for on the site.
- 7.6.2. I note the proposed water supply would be from the public mains. Should permission be granted I recommend that a standard condition in relation to connection to same.
- 7.6.3. Should permission be granted I recommend a standard condition in relation to requiring all cables to be located underground to protect visual amenity.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. I note the submitted 'Report for the purposes of Appropriate Assessment Screening' prepared by Moore Group Environmental Services. The subject site is located c.10m north the River Moy SAC (site code 002298), 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 have an 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.
- The wastewater treatment system would comply with the EPA Code of Practice (2021) Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (P.E. <10).
- Taking into account the screening determination by the P.A..

9.5. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that it can be ruled out that the proposed development would have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

9.6. Likely significant effects can be 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.10m north of the Glore (Mayo)_020 (IE_WE_34G020200) river waterbody (status “moderate”), and is above the Kilkelly Charlestown (IE_WE_G_0032) ground waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises one dwelling, a garage and on-site wastewater treatment system.

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

I recommend that permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to Policy Objective RHO 5 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, there has been a failure to utilise the Mayo rural housing design guidelines due to the excessive scale and massing of the dwelling in the local landscape in a prominent elevated position and by comparison with the older traditional vernacular architecture in the area. The dwelling would be unduly visually prominent in the rural landscape due to its position and design which would be contrary to Policy RHP 5 of the Development Plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the narrow width of the laneway (local road L5904) on to which the new vehicular access for the dwelling is proposed and the absence of passing bays along the laneway between the entrance and the junction with the R322 regional road, the proposed development would result in a traffic hazard as it would give rise to significant obstructions of the laneway where

vehicles meet between the site and junction with the R322. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

27th February 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500257-MO-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and garage with treatment plant and percolation area together with associated site works.		
Development Address	Caher, Kiltimagh, Co. Mayo.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)	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) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	X		Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
No			Conclusion
			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	X	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i). Threshold: Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.	Proceed to Q.4

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	X	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500257-MO-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and garage with treatment plant and percolation area together with associated site works.
Development Address	Caher, Kiltimagh, Co. Mayo.
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 and garage of total 200.3sqm floor area on a site area of 0.288ha 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 agricultural lands with some rural houses and agricultural sheds the vicinity. The river Glore is c.10m to the south and this is part of the River Moy SAC.
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 environmental 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)