



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-500421-MO-25

Development	Construction of a house and all associated site works.
Location	Knockaraha East, Westport, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560658.
Applicant(s)	Carrie Coleman.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal.
Appellant(s)	Carrie Coleman.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	6 th February 2026.
Inspector	C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, of area 0.23ha., consists of a grass area which currently forms the front/side garden of a single storey detached dwelling and its outbuilding. This dwelling is served by a straight driveway from the site entrance. The site is between the remainder of the site of this dwelling and a detached dwelling to the north. The site slopes gently uphill in the vicinity of the north-east corner where a mature tree is located and otherwise it slopes gently downhill towards the south. There is a hedgerow along the northern boundary and a ditch along this boundary.
- 1.2. The site is located at the end of a short cul de sac which directly serves 5 no. dwellings and there is another dwelling with a boundary on to the cul de sac but which is not accessed from it. The cul de sac joins the R335 c.165m to the north of the site entrance. The site is c.3km south-west of the town of Westport.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Construction of a detached single storey dwelling with main pitched roof form and two forward and rear projecting wings at either end.
 - Proprietary effluent treatment system.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Mayo County Council decided to refuse permission for two reasons which can be summarised as follows:

- (1) Contravention of Rural Housing Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan that would constitute haphazard development in a rural area, militate against the preservation of the rural environment and interfere with the character of the landscape.
- (2) Material contravention of condition no. 2 of the permission granted on the site which only allowed for one dwelling on the entire site area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report noted a recent previous refusal for a dwelling on the site related to contravention of Policy Objective RHO 1 of the Development Plan. It noted that the previous permission on the site included a condition which specifically permits only one house on the site and that an occupancy clause was attached to that grant of permission.

It noted the site zoning for agriculture under the Westport LAP and that the site is located in a rural area under strong urban influence. It noted that the applicant's sister obtained planning permission for a house on the site but that their parents lived in the house. It noted the applicant's original family home appears to be 3.5km from the site on the opposite side of Westport town. It considered the applicant's claim to be against the spirit of Policy Objective RHO 1 and recommended that permission be refused on this basis.

It further considered that an additional dwelling would detract from the rural character of the area and set an undesirable precedent for the sub-division of large rural sites with a refusal of permission recommended on this basis. It considered the house design to be in accordance with the Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines. It considered the site suitable for the secondary wastewater treatment unit and soil polishing filter. It noted no letters of consent for the use of the existing private lane.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer: No objection subject to condition.
- Roads Design Section: Refusal recommended given creation of increased traffic on to important regional road, contrary to MTP 28.
- MCC National Roads Office: No objection.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Development Applications Unit: No response.
- Inland Fisheries Ireland: No response.
- An Taisce: No response.

- Uisce Éireann: No response.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: No response.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None.

4.0 **Planning History**

Subject/Adjacent Site

17/401: Permission granted to Hayley Coleman by the P.A. to construct a dwelling house, garage, septic tank and percolation area.

Condition no. 2 requires only one house to be permitted for the entire site area.

Condition no. 11 is a standard rural occupancy condition for the first five years.

The driveway on the site layout plan is shown along the western site boundary. On my site inspection I noted it be to the east directly in front of the dwelling.

24/60643: Withdrawn application by Carrie Coleman for construction of a dwelling house and proprietary effluent treatment system.

Sites in the Vicinity

13510: Permission granted at adjacent site to north-west to Martin Coleman to retain and complete an existing dwelling house and garage.

5.0 **Policy Context**

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

Volume 1

Chapter 3 – Housing

Per Map 3.1, the site is located within a rural area under strong urban influence.

Section 3.4.8 Rural Single Housing

Category 1 - Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence: These areas include the open rural countryside around the Tier I (Key Towns and Strategic Growth Town) and Tier II (Self-Sustaining Growth Towns) towns. They have been designated to support the sustainable growth of the urban areas, to provide for the immediate, local rural community who have a genuine housing requirement, while directing urban generated housing into designated settlements, maintaining their vitality and viability. It is recognised that new dwellings in these areas make a contribution to the vitality and viability of the local rural and urban communities.

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 1 To facilitate single houses in the countryside. 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. An economic need would include applicants having a genuine housing need and whose future or current employment is in close proximity to the primary residence they propose to build. Local rural area includes, but is not limited to Parish, District Electoral Division and Townlands. A genuine housing need includes, but is not limited to:

- 1. Farmers, their sons and daughters, close relations or any persons taking over the running of a farm in the area in which they propose to live.*
- 2. Sons, daughters or other relations of non-farming persons who have spent a period of their lives living in the general rural area in which they propose to build a home.*
- 3. Returning immigrants who spent a period of their lives living in the rural area in which propose to build and now wish to return to reside close or convenient to family members or guardians to care for or support them or work locally or to retire.*
- 4. Persons involved in farming activity including equine enterprise, or persons employed or are intending to take up employment in any other local service, enterprise or profession.*
- 5. Persons whose health circumstances require them to live in a particular environment or close to family support. Applicants qualifying under this category of*

housing need are required to demonstrate by way of medical decentration why this is preferable.

6. Where permission has been granted for a rural housing proposal in an area deemed to be under urban pressure an occupancy condition may be imposed under section 47 of the Planning and Development act 2000. An occupancy clause shall not be applied to any successful application outside of areas deemed to be under urban pressure. The Residency Condition shall not affect the sale of the house or site by a mortgagee in possession or by any person deriving title from such a sale where force majeure applies, for example, death, illness, relationship break up, emigration, unemployment, relocation due to work issues which would necessitate a new primary place of residence.

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.

Section 3.4.12 Layout and Design

In considering proposals for development, the Council will have regard to the Guidelines on 'Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities' (2007); 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' and the accompanying 'Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide' (2009); and 'Sustainable Rural Housing – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005), together with the Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines (2008). Furthermore, regard will also be had to any specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) set out in the 'Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2018).

Chapter 6 – Movement and Transport

Policy MTP 28 It is a policy of Mayo County Council, in relation to lands adjoining Strategically Important Regional Roads to which speed limits greater than 60 km/h apply, to avoid the creation of any additional access points from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to Strategically Important Regional Roads, unless it can be demonstrated that the development is required for economic or social reasons and cannot be accessed from a non-Strategically Important Regional Road.

Chapter 10 – Natural Environment

Per Map 10.1 (Landscape Policy Areas) the site is located within Policy Area 2 where rural dwellings per Figure 10.1 are considered to have a “*medium potential to create adverse impact on the existing landscape character*”.

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.*

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 includes a minimum site size for new build housing in the rural countryside/rural transition zones of 2000sqm with exceptions for reuse/replacement structures.

Section 2.10 Effluent Treatment Systems

This requires new dwellings to be accordance with the EPA Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses and take into account the cumulative effects of existing and proposed developments in the area.

Section 7.6 Access Visibility Requirements

Table 4 Access Visibility Requirements – on regional and local roads, this requires a visibility requirement of 70m in both directions where the speed limit is 50kph and 120m in both directions where the speed limit is 80kph.

Section 7.6 and Table relates to access visibility requirements

Section 8.4 Effluent Treatment Systems

The suitability of a site is required to be determined in accordance with national guidance.

5.2. Westport Local Area Plan 2024-2030 (the LAP)

Per the Planner's Report, the P.A. considered the subject site to be zoned under Objective LUZ 9 Agriculture which is *"to reserve land for agricultural and rural uses and to preserve the amenity of the town setting. Developments for single houses within areas zoned Agriculture will be considered on their merits having regard to the Rural Housing policies and objectives of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and issues such as access, services and siting"*.

Under the land use zoning matrix, *"residential – single"* is listed as open for consideration subject to the Rural Housing Policy as outlined in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 (or subsequent plans) and objective DSP 10.

Policy DSP 9 applies to lands designated as new residential and strategic residential reserve so it is not applicable in this case.

However, having reviewed the zoning map, I note the site is outside the LAP boundary and is just adjacent to an area zoned for agriculture. Accordingly, I do not consider the site to be zoned for agriculture or subject to the LAP.

5.3. National Guidelines and Policy

Relevant national guidelines and policies include:

- The National Planning Framework First Revision (2025).
- Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005).

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.0.6km north-east of Knappagh Woods PNHA (site code 001520).
- c.0.8km south-east of Clew Bay Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 001482).
- c.1.5km north of Brackloon Woods SAC and PNHA (site code 000471).
- c.2km north-east of Lough Greney Bog NHA (site code 002455).
- c.2.4km north-east of Croagh Patrick PNHA (site code 000483).

- c.4.2km south of Coolbarreen Lough PNHA (site code 000481).
- c.5.6km south-west of Ardogommon Wood PNHA (site code 001470).
- c.6.2km north of Mweelrea/Sheeffry/Erriff Complex SAC (site code 001932).
- c.6.4km west of Kinlooney Lough PNHA (site code 001518).
- c.11.7km south of Newport River SAC (site code 002144).
- c.13.3km east of Oldhead Wood SAC and PNHA (site code 000532).
- c.13.5km east of West Connacht Coast SAC (site code 002998).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the first party appeal by Carrie Coleman, the applicant, can be summarised as follows:

Refusal Reason No. 1

- Supporting documents (including school attendance, parish priest letter and financial statements) included to show the applicant has lived in the general rural area her whole life such that she qualifies under Objective RHO 1.
- The Council in the case of her sister under reg. ref. 17/401 accepted that her sister met the criteria in the same circumstances as the current applicant.
- Under ABP-322579-25 the Board found a genuine housing need in an area under strong urban pressure around Castlebar where the site was c.3.5km from the family home. The applicant's site is c.4km from her original home.
- The house is located within an existing cluster of 6 rural dwellings and infills a gap between two existing houses and there are a number of clusters in the vicinity as shown in the submitted aerial photograph.
- The FFL and ridge height of the existing house to the north are higher than those of the proposed house where the site also slopes downhill such that it will be partially screened from view and would not detract from the rural character of Knockaraha East.

- The area is residential notwithstanding the agricultural zoning.
- 6 no. precedents in three clusters are cited (Appendix 2 of submission) where the Council granted permission in similar circumstances and at greater density, for example reg. ref.s 23114 and 23168.
- In the case of ACP-322579-25 the Board considered the precedent set by previous permissions in the area, the bespoke design and the planning gain in consolidating housing in a cluster.
- Section 4.4 of the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005 notes that a clustered approach avoids individual entrances on to heavily trafficked roads.
- The proposal will not interfere with the residential amenities of housing in the vicinity and as confirmed in a letter of support from the house to the north.
- There will be no adverse impact on the landscape.

Refusal Reason No. 2

- Given no. 2 of reg. ref. 19/401 was necessary to ensure the development would be maintained for its intended purpose to meet a family housing need and not be sub-divided for speculative house building. This application is for a permanent family dwelling.
- There has been a material change in circumstances in terms of housing need to allow reconsideration of this condition.
- The proposed house site is 0.23ha leaving a private amenity space of c.0.3ha.
- I draw the attention of the Commission to the Appendices submitted with the appeal including aerial photographs, maps, details of the applicant's links to the area, land folios including wayleave detail, school and church letters, financial statements and a commencement notice for the adjacent house.

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 report/s 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.
- Visual and Residential Amenity.
- Wastewater Treatment.
- Access.
- Other Matters

7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. I note the appeal in relation to the P.A. refusal under Objective RHO 1 of the CDP. I note the site location outside of the LAP boundary for Westport and adjacent to but outside of the zoned land area of the LAP. Accordingly, I do not consider that the LAP policy applies in this case.
- 7.2.2. I note the site is c.2km from the urban edge of Westport and is c.3km from the town edge. Accordingly, notwithstanding the pattern of development with clusters of rural housing and ribbon development in the vicinity and also the R335, I consider the site to be in a rural area designated in the CDP as a rural area under strong urban influence. In such areas applicants for a new house are required to comply with Policy Objective RHO 1 of the CDP and must demonstrate an economic or social need to live in the area.
- 7.2.3. I note the applicant has advised she grew up across the estuary in a rural area c.4km to the north as the crow flies. I note that notwithstanding the refusal of permission in relation to Objective RHO 1 that the P.A. granted permission to the applicant's sister on the adjacent site to the applicant with the same background circumstances albeit under a previous development plan. I note that in that case, due to circumstances, the applicant's parents are the occupants of the adjacent dwelling and folios have been furnished to show the sale of the family home across the inlet. I note the Commission is not bound by the previous determinations of the P.A. and I will assess the application de novo in line with current CDP policy.

- 7.2.4. I note the submitted documentation including school and parish letters support the applicant's assertion that she grew up in the rural area c.4km to the north. I note that the applicant is claiming a genuine housing need under category 2, "*Sons, daughters or other relations of non-farming persons who have spent a period of their lives living in the general rural area in which they propose to build a home*". Based on this wording I note the requirement to have lived "*in the general rural area*" in which the house is proposed. It also states that "*Local rural area includes, but is not limited to Parish, District Electoral Division and Townlands*".
- 7.2.5. In terms of the ordinary meaning of the phrases "*general rural area*" and "*local rural area*", I note the CDP places no specific distance limitation on such areas. I note that the rural areas are not contiguous and that the subject rural area ends to the north c.500m to the south of Westport Quay where it meets the western urban area of the town which has to be passed through to get to the rural area to the north-west of the town on the other side of the coastal inlet. I therefore do not consider the rural area to the west of Westport across the inlet to be in the same rural area as the subject rural area which is to the south-west of the town.
- 7.2.6. I note this notwithstanding that under reg. ref. 17/401 the P.A. effectively found the opposite. However, in the decision to refuse the subject application, I note the P.A. has reversed this position and I consider this latest position to be consistent with CDP Policy Objective RHO 1. I note the precedents in the immediate area cited by the appellant including the most recent of these whereby single rural dwellings were permitted in cluster developments.
- 7.2.7. In relation to rural housing policy in the CDP, I note no policy on cluster development. While I agree in principle with the appellant's assertion that clustered rural housing is preferable to one-off rural housing, I do not consider clustered rural housing to be preferable to urban housing given CDP policy under Policy Objective RHO 1 only to allow rural housing in exceptional circumstances. The rationale for this is clear in the CDP and per national policy where new housing within existing settlements is preferred based on the principles of sustainable development including seeking to avoid the uneconomic provision of public infrastructure.
- 7.2.8. I am therefore satisfied that the P.A. refusal in relation to Policy Objective RHO 1 is reasonable and is justified based on the circumstances of the applicant and the

wording of the policy. In this context, I agree with the P.A. that the proposed development would constitute haphazard development in a rural area and would therefore militate against the preservation of the rural environment and interfere with the character of the landscape which it is necessary to preserve.

7.3. Visual and Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1. I note the appellant has asserted that the design accords with Policy Objective RHP 5 of the CDP where site specific design solutions are expected. I note the submitted drawings with the dwelling mainly in a simple pitched roof form and broken up somewhat by the wing elements at either end including the modest front gable projections and the limited height, scale and bulk of the design with eaves of c.2.67m and ridge at 5.667m.
- 7.3.2. I agree with the P.A. assessment that this modest scale and simple form, appropriately broken up, accords with the Mayo Rural Housing Design Guidelines. In my opinion, it would integrate with the surroundings in the rural cluster although in the absence of an economic or social justification it would erode the rural character of the site to a significant degree as noted in Section 7.2 above. This, in my opinion, would be only evident on the site and from the adjacent internal driveway and also by reference to the position of the dwelling in relation to the existing dwelling to the south given the position of the front building line.
- 7.3.3. In terms of the site sub-division I note the remaining site area for the existing dwelling would be 0.47ha which I consider to be appropriate although I note the layout is not ideal in that the existing dwelling would be relatively close to the proposed dwelling given the remaining area available to the west.
- 7.3.4. As noted above, I consider the scale of the development to be appropriately modest for the site and the surroundings including by reference to the limited views of the site due to its position behind a dwelling and where there is natural planting/screening along the northern and southern boundaries and it would be further screened by the proposed eastern boundary planting.
- 7.3.5. I note the position and level of the dwelling on the site with FFL at 27.8m by comparison with the dwelling to the south of FFL 26.77m and to the north at 28.45m. There would be ample separation distances from adjacent properties to the north (20.81m from the house and 5.47m to 9.06m from the boundary) and south (24.7m

from the house and 14.89m from the boundary) for a single storey house. I am satisfied that there would be no significant overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impacts in the vicinity.

7.4. Wastewater Treatment

- 7.4.1. In relation to wastewater treatment, I note the submitted Site Characterisation Form. The aquifer is noted to be poor and highly vulnerable. The groundwater protection response is noted to be R1. The depth of trial hole is noted to be 2.3m with silt/clay found below ground level. Based on the three trial hole tests the sub-surface percolation value was noted to be 20 and the surface percolation value was noted to be 0. It found the depth of unsaturated soil /subsoil beneath the invert of gravel to be 2m and it proposes a secondary treatment system and polishing filter be installed.
- 7.4.2. Based on the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (P.E. <10) tables, in relation to separation distances (Table 6.2) I note no significant issues where the system would be located in the southern end of the site. Per Table 6.3 of the EPA Code I note the minimum required depth is 0.9m for polishing filters following secondary systems and this would be met. I note also that the percolation results are appropriate per Table 6.4.
- 7.4.3. In relation to the existing wastewater treatment system for the existing dwelling, noting that its site would be sub-divided, I note no undue effects given its location in the south-east corner of the site of the adjacent dwelling and the adequate separation distances (significantly more than 10m) in relation to same. I note no significant issues in relation to the density of development in the vicinity. Therefore, similar to the P.A., I consider the proposed wastewater treatment system would accord with the EPA Code. This would comply with Section 2.10 of Volume 2 of the CDP and is acceptable.

7.5. Access

- 7.5.1. In relation to access, I note the site would be located at the end of a private cul de sac where vehicular speeds would be very low. It would be accessed via the driveway of the adjacent dwelling with adequate visibility (c.23m) in both directions at the entrance. There would be good visibility along the laneway where the existing site entrance meets the lane. I note the Council's Roads Design section noted that

the creation of increased traffic on to an important regional road, the R335, would be contrary to policy MTP 28 of the CDP.

7.5.2. I note the 120m sightlines shown in both directions where the entrance meets the R335 where the speed limit is 80kph accords with CDP policy. While noting the limited scale of development, I note it would create a precedent for similar development which could cumulatively generate increased traffic from existing accesses to strategically important regional roads without an economic or social justification which would be contrary to Policy MTP 28.

7.5.3. I therefore consider the access arrangements to be contrary to Policy MTP 28. As I consider this to be a new issue and I have otherwise recommended that permission be refused, I do not propose to include it as an additional reason for refusal. However, the Commission may wish to consider its view on this matter.

7.6. Other Matters

7.6.1. I note refusal reason no. 2 of the P.A. related to condition no.2 of the permission on the site for a dwelling which required only one house on the site. I note policy on rural sites per Volume 2 Section 2.3 of the CDP requires minimum site sizes of 2,000sqm. In the case of the previous permission, I note the site size was noted at 0.7ha. For the subject application I note the site size to be 0.23ha. leaving a remaining site size for the other dwelling of 0.47ha. Having regard to the site layout plan for the proposed dwelling and the site sub-division for the existing dwelling, I am satisfied that there would be sufficient open space around both dwellings both in quantitative terms and to separate them. Therefore, noting that I consider there to be no planning policy basis to maintain Condition no. 2, I recommend that refusal reason no. 2 not be upheld.

7.6.2. In relation to water supply, I note the letter on the file confirming acceptance to connect to the local group water scheme. In relation to drainage, noting there would be ample open areas on the site, should permission be granted I recommend a standard SUDS condition to ensure surface water drainage is catered for on the site.

8.0 EIA Screening

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

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.0.8km south-east of Clew Bay Complex SAC, the nearest European site.

9.2. The proposed development comprises construction of a house 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 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 above the Clifden Castlebar (IE_WE_G_0017) ground waterbody (status “good”), is c.84m south-east of the Cloghan_010 (IE_WE_32C160630) river waterbody (status “moderate”) and is c.320m north of the Owenwee (Mayo)_020 (IE_WE_32O060600) river waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises one dwelling 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 the nature of the construction impacts which can be managed by condition.
 - The surface management system that can be conditioned.
 - The wastewater treatment system would comply with the EPA Code of Practice (2021) Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (P.E. <10).
 - The distance from the nearest surface water bodies and lack of ecological connections thereto.
- 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 for the reason stated below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Based on the information submitted, it is considered that the proposed development, if granted, would contravene Rural Housing Objective RHO 1 of Volume 1 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, would constitute haphazard development in a rural area and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment. The proposed development would therefore interfere with the character of the landscape which it is necessary to preserve and if permitted would 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 March 2026

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Coimisiún Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500421-MO-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and all associated site works.		
Development Address	Knockaraha East, Westport, 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)
			Conclusion
No			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-500421-MO-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and all associated site works.
Development Address	Knockaraha East, Westport, Co. Mayo.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</p> <p>One new dwelling total 279sqm floor area on a site area of 0.23ha in a rural area.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</p> <p>The rural area includes agricultural lands with some rural houses in the immediate vicinity. No sites of historic, cultural, ecological or archaeological interest or significance in the vicinity.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</p> <p>Modest scale and domestic nature of the development would not give rise to significant environmental effects on the site or in the vicinity.</p>

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)