



Inspector's Report

PL-500546-SO-25

Development	Extension and renovation of existing one and a half storey dwelling and all associated site works
Location	4 Ros Beoláin, Rosses Point, County Sligo, F91 WD80
Planning Authority	Sligo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/60420
Applicant(s)	Clare and Jeremy Lathom-Sharp
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Eithne Tolan Frances and Sean Larkin
Observer(s)	Rory and Mary Callagy
Date of Site Inspection	27 th March 2026
Inspector	Philip Maguire

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Site Location and Description	3
3.0	Proposed Development.....	3
4.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
5.0	Planning History.....	6
6.0	Policy Context.....	7
7.0	EIA Screening.....	9
8.0	The Appeal	9
9.0	Assessment	11
10.0	AA Screening.....	16
11.0	Water Framework Directive.....	17
12.0	Recommendation.....	17
13.0	Reasons and Considerations	17
14.0	Conditions.....	17
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	20
	Appendix 2: WFD Screening	22

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This case relates to appeals by E. Tolan and F & S Larkin under the provisions of Section 37 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended ('the Act'), following a grant of permission by Sligo Co. Co. in accordance with S. 34 of the Act.
- 1.2. This Inspector's Report (IR) and recommendation is made pursuant to Section 146(2) of the Act. The Commission is required to consider both before determining the case.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. Situated within 'Ros Beoláin' housing development, the appeal site is located north, northeast of Rosses Point village centre in northwest Co. Sligo. The posted speed limit through the village is 50kph and vehicular access to the site is via a cul-de-sac type estate road off the L3310 where a special speed limit of 30kph applies throughout.
- 2.2. Ros Beoláin is an established development of nine dormer-style houses of similar scale and form, one of which is accessed directly off the L3310. The remaining houses are grouped around and accessed via the internal estate road which follows the steeply sloping landform before reaching a more level area to the north of the estate. The estate road includes a footpath and streetlighting to the east and north and is flanked in parts by stone walls of various heights where level changes are most pronounced.
- 2.3. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.075ha and includes a dual fronted house and garden. The northern (front) boundary addresses the estate road and is defined by a low stone wall with hedgerow to the rear. A break in the wall immediately in front of the house allows for the parking of vehicles. The western boundary is similarly defined to the front of the building line with a timber fence and higher hedging to the rear for privacy. The eastern boundary follows a bend in the estate road and thus the wall increases in height as the ground level slopes down towards the main road. In this regard, the southern (rear) boundary is defined by a retaining wall and hedge which sits above an enclosed planted area with separate retaining wall along the estate road.

3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. Planning permission is sought for a rear extension at ground and first floor levels.

3.2. The proposed development is described in the statutory notices as:

“Extension and renovation of existing one and a half storey dwelling including extension at rear to ground & first floor. Change in position of existing entrance porch. Extension to rear roof with two gable pitches on first floor. Roof to existing side raised with two new dormers to the north and one to the south. Roof overhangs removed and all windows, doors and guttering replaced.”

3.3. The application documents include a Design and Access Statement (McGarry Moon Architects, May 2025). It addresses the proposed alterations, including materiality, as well as the planning history of the site and relevant history in the surrounding area.

3.4. The planning application form indicates that 87.40sq.m of gross floor space is proposed with a total of 4.10sq.m to be demolished. The existing gross floor space is stated as 201.30sq.m and 5 no. bedrooms are illustrated on the drawings. The proposed development would result in a 284.60sq.m, 6-bedroomed dwellinghouse.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

4.1.1. Permission was granted on 2nd December 2025 subject to 3 no. conditions, including:
Condition 3 Development contributions.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. The assessment in the Planner’s Report (01/12/25) can be summarised as follows:

Visual Impact / Siting / Design

- Notes the previous application under PA ref. 25/60214 which was refused and states that the proposal is reduced in scale and is of altered form and design.
- States that the side extension is subordinate to the main dwelling in terms of form.
- States that the first-floor extension is now contained within the width of the dwelling.
- Notes there is greater vertical emphasis, with less glazing and thus more traditional.
- Notes the prominent siting of the dwelling in the streetscape and considers the proposal to be an appropriate design solution in terms of scale and form.

- States that the proposal is well considered in terms of design detailing and considers it more reflective and complementary of the existing house and estate.
- Alterations to the front elevation are not so significant as to render the dwelling out of keeping with the character of the area.
- Considers the proposal in line with Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan.

Residential Amenity

- States that the extensions are generally positioned away from the shared boundary so as not to unduly impact on amenity due to overshadowing or loss of light.
- Notes that windows serving habitable rooms are within the front and rear and east elevations so any outlooks would be towards and over shared public spaces or the front gardens of Nos. 2 and 3 where reduced privacy would be expected.
- States that the proposal would not result in any significant detrimental loss of amenity due to overlooking or loss of privacy.

Highway Safety / Traffic / Car Parking

- Considers that the proposed extension would not impact on road safety by reducing the intervisibility between road users.
- Considers that the increase in bedrooms is not so significant so as to result in haphazard parking or vehicle movements that may impact on road safety, noting there is off-street parking for c. 3-4 cars to the front.

Other

- No alterations proposed to the existing surface water, wastewater or water supply.
- States that there is no Plan policy which would prevent the use of an existing dwelling as a second home / holiday home and the layout maintains a single house.

Development Contributions

- Notes the requirement in the Development Contributions Scheme 2018-2024 for contributions to be made for house extensions > 150sq.m of the original house.

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer (23/10/25) No objection subject to conditions.

4.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

4.4. **Third Party Observations**

4.4.1. The planning authority received 5 no. observation. Issues raised reflect third-party appeal grounds. Concerns, as summarised from the Planner's Report, relate to:

- Scale, form and design out-of-keeping with the character of the estate/area.
- Impact on 'skyline'.
- Design is not of a residential character or appearance.
- Overlooking / loss of privacy.
- Impact on road safety.
- Siting of this dwelling was originally to be a 'greenspace' for the estate.
- Potential use as a holiday home or for multiple households.

5.0 **Planning History**

5.1. **Appeal Site**

5.1.1. PA ref. 25/60214 – in July 2025, the planning authority refused ground and first floor extensions to the side and rear of the existing dwelling incorporating a flat roof structure at upper floor level with cantilevered ends. Having regard to the scale, form and design, it was considered that the proposed development would have an overbearing visual impact and would be out-of-keeping with the character, scale and form of the other dwellings within the Ros Beoláin housing development. The proposal was therefore contrary to Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan which states that extensions should generally be subordinate to and integrate with the main building.

5.1.2. PA ref. 06/1295 – in December 2007, the decision of the planning authority was upheld on appeal (PL.21.224109) and permission granted for a rear and side extension etc.

5.2. **Surrounding Area**

5.2.1. PA ref. 21/33– in May 2021, the planning granted permission alterations to the front of No. 8 Ros Beoláin in addition to a single-storey flat roof extension to the rear etc.

5.3. Cited by Applicant

Rosses Upper, Rosses Point

- 5.3.1. PA ref. 24/60016 – in April 2024, the planning authority granted permission for a contemporary single-storey house extension to the front with mono-pitched roof etc.

Blennick Rock, Rosses Point

- 5.3.2. PA ref. 22/336 – in January 2023, the planning authority granted permission to retain a contemporary flat roof extension at first floor level to the front of the dwelling etc.

Virginia Lodge, Rosses Point

- 5.3.3. PA ref. 21/6 – in April 2021, the planning authority granted permission for a part two-storey, part single-storey extension to the side and rear of the dwellinghouse etc.

The Old Village Road, Rosses Point

- 5.3.4. PA ref. 17/447 – in November 2018, the decision of the planning authority was upheld on appeal (ABP-301590-18) and permission granted for a contemporary two-storey flat roof extension to the rear of the dwellinghouse along with associated demolition etc.

Radharc Na Rí, Rosses Point

- 5.3.5. PA ref. 16/10 – in April 2016, the planning authority granted permission for a two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling incorporating contemporary flat roof structure etc.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Local Planning Policy

Sligo County Development Plan 2024-2030

- 6.1.1. The current Development Plan came into effect on 11th November 2024. The Plan was subject to a draft Ministerial Direction in July 2024 and is pending a final decision by the Minister following public consultation and OPR recommendations (Oct. 2024). The planning authority decision was made under the provisions of this current Plan.
- 6.1.2. The appeal site is located within the development limit of Rosses Point and thus subject to the provisions of Chapter 22 of the Development Plan (Rosses Point Village Plan). It is zoned 'eRES – existing residential areas' in the associated adopted zoning map.

6.1.3. Section 10.5.3 of the Plan sets out the zoning objective for 'eRES – existing and infill residential use'. It seeks to protect and enhance the residential amenity of established areas and their communal or public open space and allow for small-scale infill development which is appropriate to the character and pattern in the immediate area.

6.1.4. Other relevant guidance is set out in Chapter 33 (Development Management Standards). Section 33.2.16 (Extensions to dwellings) states the following:

“Extensions to dwellings represent an important way of prolonging the life of a house, be it a vernacular dwelling, a more recent bungalow or other house type. In the case of a vernacular dwelling, extensions should be sympathetic to the scale of the existing building and should enhance its character.

The complete redesign and extension of poorly designed dwellings is acceptable, subject to the residential amenity and the design guidelines contained in this chapter. The Planning Authority will adopt a more conservative approach to proposed extensions to vernacular dwellings which contribute to the local character of an area.

The Council will require proposals for extensions to comply with the following:

- i. the extension should generally be subordinated to the main building (i.e. to be or appear smaller when seen from a public road). Exceptions will be considered when the original building is so small that a subordinate extension would not be able to reasonably accommodate the needs of the occupants;*
- ii. the form and design should integrate with the main building, generally following window proportions, detailing and finishes, including texture, materials and colour;*
- iii. the extension shall be designed to ensure that it will not result in overshadowing, loss of daylight or overlooking of adjacent residential properties.”*

6.2. Natural Heritage Designations

6.2.1. Nearest proposed Natural Heritage Areas (pNHAs):

- Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) (000627) – c. 0.25km north

6.2.2. Nearest Natura 2000 designations:

- Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC (000627) – c. 0.25km north
- Cummeen Strand SPA (004035) – c. 0.41km south, southeast

7.0 EIA Screening

7.1.1. The proposed development is not a class of development set out in Schedule 5, Part 1 or Part 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended ('the Regulations'), and therefore no preliminary examination is required (see Appendix 1).

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

8.1.1. As noted, separate third-party appeals have been lodged by E. Tolan and F & S Larkin.

8.1.2. The appeal by Eithne Tolan can be summarised as follows:

- Proposal does not respect the scale and proportion of surrounding buildings and would be entirely out of character to the detriment of the local environment.
- Two doors in the front elevation give the impression that there are two dwellings.
- Proposal would lack harmony with the other houses in the estate due to its size, design and visual appearance with features to the rear out of place.
- Refers to Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan and states that the proposed development would overlook at least two other houses in the estate.
- Proposal would result in a significant loss of privacy for at least one house.
- Increasing the size and capacity of the house will exacerbate traffic issues.

8.1.3. The appeal by Frances and Sean Larkin can be summarised as follows:

- Proposal will have a strong visual impact on other houses in the estate and impact on the privacy of some of the houses.
- Expresses concerns that the extension is too high, out of proportion and will dominate the skyline due to its central position.
- Proposal will compromise the privacy currently enjoyed by Nos. 2 and 3 Ros Beoláin and this is contrary to Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan.
- Proposal does not ameliorate the existing traffic hazard caused by the blind corner to the east of the plot and it will be exacerbated by the extra bedrooms proposed.

- No provision for the extra parking a 7-bed house will require with lack of footpath preventing any on-street parking thus exacerbating an already dangerous situation.

8.2. Applicant Response

8.2.1. McGarry Moon Architects responded on behalf of the applicants, Clare and Jeremy Lathom-Sharp. The response can be summarised as follows:

- Regarding 'privacy and positioning', references the comments in Sligo County Council's Planner's Report in respect of 'Residential Amenity' and states that there are no adverse impacts on any of the neighbouring properties.
- In terms of appearance and size, states that the proposed development is within the extents previously permitted at the appeal site.
- In relation to traffic and safety, states that no road traffic collision data has been submitted to substantiate claims and thus is not a material planning consideration.
- No objection was raised by the planning authority in relation to traffic safety.
- Cul-de-sacs are considered low traffic environments and the proposal will not introduce significant additional traffic.
- States that the proposal will provide 6-bedrooms, not 7-bedrooms as claimed and the existing parking is in accordance with the standards for a single dwelling, thus no additional parking demand arises.

8.3. Planning Authority Response

8.3.1. The planning authority's response can be summarised as follows:

- Refers to the Planner's Report and other reports in connection with the proposal as well as the decision of the planning authority to grant permission.
- Appellant's have not submitted any additional information as part of the appeal that would alter the planning authority's decision.
- The proposal would be suitable at this location and is consistent with the policies and other relevant provisions of the Sligo Development Plan 2024-2030.

8.4. Observations

8.4.1. An observation received from Rory and Mary Callagy can be summarised as follows:

- Proposal exacerbates the risk of a crash on the blind corner east of the site.
- Retaining wall to the south is too high and out of plumb and a safety risk.
- Moving the rear of the house closer, and with increased glazing, will adversely impact on the privacy that No. 2 Ros Beoláin presently enjoys.
- Existing residential amenity impacts compounded by tenancies over the years.
- Reducing the garden space will exacerbate the reduction in privacy for No. 2.

9.0 **Assessment**

9.1. **Preliminary Points**

9.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on the appeal file, including the appeal submissions and observations, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal.

9.1.2. The issues can be addressed under the following headings:

- Residential Amenity
- Visual Amenity
- Traffic Impact
- Other

9.2. **Residential Amenity**

9.2.1. The appellants raise concerns in relation to potential impacts on privacy by reason of overlooking, and both refer to Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan in this regard. Whilst I note that both appellants reside to the north of the appeal site, their specific concerns relate to the properties to the south, namely Nos. 2 and 3 Ros Beoláin. In this regard, I note the observations by the resident of No. 2 Ros Beoláin raise similar concerns, stating that the proposal will compound the impacts already experienced and similarly the appellants raise concerns in relation to the two external front doors.

9.2.2. The applicant, on the other hand, refers to the commentary in the Planner's Report in respect of residential amenity impacts. This is summarised in section 4.2.1 above and there is nothing in the planning authority appeal submission that alters that position.

Impact on Neighbours

- 9.2.3. The appeal site is bounded to the north and east by the estate road, to the west by the curtilage of No. 5 Ros Beoláin and to the south by an enclosed planted area with separate retaining wall along the estate road. The existing dwelling is centrally located and orientated northwards. It has a finished floor level of 36.00mAOD. The rear elevation faces south and is prominent when travelling to the site along the estate road.
- 9.2.4. Bar the curtilage of No. 5 to the west, the appeal site is effectively 'islanded' and thus the separation distances from the front elevation to the appellant's houses are c. 28 and 33 metres respectively, albeit not directly opposing. The separation distance from the rear elevation to the observer's house is roughly 16 metres and a distance of some 22 metres exists between the rear elevation and No. 3 Ros Beoláin to the southeast.
- 9.2.5. Whilst the finished floor levels of the surrounding houses have not been illustrated on any of the layout drawings, I do note that Nos. 6 to 9 Ros Beoláin are elevated above the appeal site and in turn it is notably elevated above Nos. 2 and 3 Ros Beoláin. In this regard, the rear garden of the appeal site would appear to be roughly level with the upper floor windows in their respective front elevations. However, given the orientation of No. 2 Ros Beoláin, existing views towards the front windows are oblique.
- 9.2.6. The proposed extension is located primarily to the rear of the house. It does however include some remodelling to the front elevation with a marginal relocation of the existing porch, taking account of the upper floor windows, and increased eaves and ridge height to the side projection. This projection includes two upper floor windows but at a directly opposing separation distance of c. 28 metres no amenity issues arise.
- 9.2.7. To the rear, however, the proposed extension would project some 1.75 metres beyond the existing rear building line over a length of c. 18 metres. It would include a double apex roof structure with ridge height of c. 7.10m to the central and eastern extent and a single-storey flat roof structure to the western extent. A dormer window opening would project from the rear roof slope of the extended side projection just shy of the rear building line. Similar sized opes would be located in the double apex projection.
- 9.2.8. Given the curved layout of the southern boundary, the separation distances would be reduced from 7.084m and 4.804m to 5.325m and 3.375m respectively. Thus, the extended house would be marginally closer to the observer's property as well as the house at No. 3 Ros Beoláin. However, given the set back of the rear dormer window,

the nearest window to the observer's property, and the distance to the other upper floor windows, c. 22 and 27 metres respectively, together with their orientation, I consider that any increased overlooking would be marginal and limited to oblique views. I draw a similar conclusion for the occupants of No. 3 Ros Beoláin where separation distances are even greater although I do consider the rear boundary hedgerow should be retained and augmented to address any perceived concerns of overlooking. In this regard, I do note that extensive glazing is proposed at ground floor level to the rear.

- 9.2.9. Whilst there will be an appreciable change for the observer and indeed the occupants of No. 3 Ros Beoláin, and to a lesser extent the other residents of the estate, there will be no significant overshadowing or overbearance on any property by virtue of the location / orientation of the extension having regard to the separation distances and sun path. Thus, the proposal complies with Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan.

Proposed Use

- 9.2.10. As noted, one of the appellant's suggest that the two doors in the front elevation give the impression that there are two dwellings. Given the number of bedrooms proposed and in the absence of any obvious rationale for an additional door within c. 5m of the front porch, I understand their concerns. In this case, I recommend the existing house and proposed extension be jointly occupied as a single residential unit by condition.

Conclusion on Residential Amenity

- 9.2.11. On balance, I do not consider that the proposed development would adversely impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties by reason of overshadowing, overbearance, or overlooking nor would it compromise the amenities of the occupants.
- 9.2.12. If the Commission are minded to grant permission, I recommend that standard construction hours and a restriction on any annex-type uses are conditioned in addition to retention and augmentation of the rear boundary hedgerow to a suitable height.

9.3. Visual Amenity

- 9.3.1. The appellants suggest that the proposal is out of scale and proportion with the surrounding buildings and the character of the area and thus will dominate the skyline.
- 9.3.2. The applicant, on the other hand, states that the proposed development is within the extents of a development previously permitted at the site (appeal ref. PL.21.224109).

- 9.3.3. The planning authority state that the proposal would be suitable at this location and is consistent with the policies and other relevant provisions of the Development Plan.
- 9.3.4. The general arrangements of the proposal are described above and, in this regard, I am satisfied that the extended side projection, with increased ridge height and eaves level, are subordinate to the existing dwelling and generally in keeping with the character of the estate. In that regard, I note the side projection of No. 2 Ros Beoláin is similar to that proposed, albeit smaller in scale and without the upper floor windows.
- 9.3.5. Similarly, the bulk of the rear extension appears to take its design cues from No. 1 Ros Beoláin which incorporates pitched roof rear projections adjacent to a smaller dormer window. There is no increase in the overall height of the dwelling and whilst I accept that it will remain prominent on approach given its location, I fully concur with the Planner's Report in that it is an appropriate design solution in terms of scale and form.
- 9.3.6. Moreover, the window openings to the front include a distinct vertical emphasis and represent a rationalisation of the disproportionate openings that currently exist, and together with the relocation of the front porch, the front elevation will appear more balanced. This, coupled with the detailing and finishes to the rear, including silver grey cladding to the upper floor projecting elements, allows for a contemporary structure of high design quality that is consistent with Section 33.2.16 of the Development Plan.

Conclusion on Visual Amenity

- 9.3.7. On balance, I do not consider the proposed development will adversely affect the visual amenity or indeed the established character of the area, notwithstanding the general uniformity, albeit somewhat altered appearance, of the Ros Beoláin housing estate.
- 9.3.8. If the Commission are minded to grant permission, I recommend that the external finishes are carefully modulated to ensure the maximum integration with the estate.

9.4. Traffic Impact

- 9.4.1. In relation to traffic impacts, the appellants and observer suggest that increasing the size of the house with extra bedrooms will exacerbate an existing traffic hazard caused by virtue of the blind corner which segues around the southern and eastern site boundaries. Concerns are also raised in relation to in curtilage and on-street parking.
- 9.4.2. The applicant, on the other hand, states that these concerns, in the absence of any substantiating information, cannot be deemed a material planning consideration. They

also note that cul-de-sacs, by their very nature, are low speed environments and state that the existing parking is in accordance with the standards for a single dwellinghouse.

- 9.4.3. As noted, the planning authority appeal response refers to the Planner's Report and other reports in connection with the proposal. The only other report in connection with the proposal is that of the Area Engineer. It raises no concerns in relation to road safety subject to a number of conditions in relation to surface water disposal. These conditions are grouped into a single condition (Condition 2) in the notification to grant.
- 9.4.4. The appeal site is located off a narrow local road (L3310) which runs generally parallel to the R291 to the south and where the posted speed limit is 50kph. The engineers report indicates that the estate road is county road L33112 where a speed limit of 50kph also applies, however a road sign at the entrance indicates a 30kph / slow zone.
- 9.4.5. The vertical and horizontal alignment of the estate road mean that traffic speeds are generally low on approach to the appeal site and whilst they may be higher in the opposite direction (downhill), I observed that the increase would be marginal. In this regard, I agree that this particular cul-de-sac is a low-speed environment and thus the impact on traffic safety as a result of the proposed extension is likely to be negligible.

Conclusion on Traffic Impact

- 9.4.6. For clarity, it is important to note that the proposal would result in a 6-bed house, a net increase of one bedroom. I am therefore satisfied that no additional traffic or parking impacts would occur and thus no public safety or traffic hazard issues would arise.

9.5. Other

- 9.5.1. Finally, I note that the observer raises concerns regarding the condition of the retaining wall along the estate road and south of the appeal site, stating that it is out of plumb.
- 9.5.2. I inspected the wall during my site visit and note that it appears marginally bowed and parts of the structure are missing in places. That section of the wall has not been shown as within the applicant's control however on the site location map or indeed the existing site block plan (Dwg. No. 0582-(EX)-001). Whilst I acknowledge the concerns of the observer, there is no mechanism within this application/appeal to address same.
- 9.5.3. The above assessment represents my *de novo* consideration of all planning issues material to the proposal for planning permission for the house extension as detailed.

10.0 AA Screening

Screening the need for Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered case PL-500546-SO-25 in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The proposed development is located within an urban residential area and comprises the extension and renovation of the existing one and a half storey dwelling together with minimal demolition to facilitate such works.

The closest European sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network, are Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC (000627) and Cummeen Strand SPA (004035) located c. 0.25km north and c. 0.41km south, southeast, respectively.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and domestic nature of the development;
- The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European site; and
- Taking into account the screening determination of the LPA.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

11.1. A screening for the purposes of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) has also been carried out. On the basis of objective information, I conclude that the proposal 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 waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives. Therefore, it can be excluded from any further assessment (Appendix 2).

12.0 Recommendation

12.1. I recommend that permission be **granted** for the reasons and considerations below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

13.1. Having regard to the provisions of Sligo County Development Plan 2024-2030, the location of the proposed development within the development limit of Rosses Point and in an existing residential area, the small scale nature of the proposal in the context of the appeal site and surrounding area, and the prevailing pattern and character of development in this area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity, would not endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard or impact on public health. The proposal would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of

development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interests of clarity.

2. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. (a) The southern boundary hedgerow shall be maintained at a height no lower than 1.2 metres above the existing ground level of the rear garden and augmented with additional planting in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

(b) Any plants, trees or hedging which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of visual and residential amenity.

4. The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

5. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

6. Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

7. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Philip Maguire

Inspectorate

1st April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500546-SO-25
Proposed Development Summary	Extension and renovation of existing one and a half storey dwelling and all associated site works
Development Address	4 Ros Beoláin, Rosses Point, County Sligo, F91 WD80
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2: WFD Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref.	PL-500546-SO-25	Townland, address	4 Ros Beoláin, Rosses Point, County Sligo, F91 WD80
Description of project		Extension and renovation of existing one and a half storey dwelling and all associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		<p>Irregular shaped brownfield site with a stated area of 0.075ha.</p> <p>Detached house located centrally at c. 36mAOD and elevated above public road (L3310).</p> <p>Situated within an established housing development of similar properties served by public mains, wastewater and surface water infrastructure.</p> <p>No other surface water drainage vectors evident i.e., ditches, streams etc.</p>	
Proposed surface water details		'Public Sewer / Drain' ticked in Section 20 of the Planning Application Form.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		'Existing' 'Public Mains' ticked in Section 20 of the Planning Application Form.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		'Existing' 'Public Sewer' ticked in Section 20 of the Planning Application Form.	
Others?		N/a	

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface runoff, drainage, groundwater)
Transitional Waterbody	c. 390m south	Garavoge Estuary IE_WE_470_010 0	Poor	Review	None identified	No –stormwater outfalls public sewer / drain.
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Rosses Point IE_WE_G_0053	Good	Not at risk	None identified	Yes – infiltration of runoff that does not convey to public sewer / drain (i.e., from paved areas / hard surfaces).

Step 2: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Ground	Rosses Point IE_WE_G_00 53	New – via exposed soils i.e., foundation trenches and excavations.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	None - standard construction practice anticipated.	No	Screened out

OPERATIONAL PHASE

1.	Ground	Rosses Point IE_WE_G_00 53	Existing – infiltration of runoff that does not convey to storm sewer.	Hydrocarbon spillages.	None required – limited infiltration anticipated.	No	Screened out
----	--------	----------------------------------	--	------------------------	---	----	--------------

DECOMMISSIONING PHASE

1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

This page is intentionally left blank.