



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500553-DL-26

Development	Construction of a rear extension to dwelling
Location	Main Street, (Gortnamucklagh Td.) Glenties, Co. Donegal
Planning Authority	Donegal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/61880
Applicant(s)	Thadeus Boyle
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Jimmy, Patrick & Mary Campbell
Observer(s)	None
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.....	6
7.0	EIA Screening.....	9
8.0	The Appeal	9
9.0	Assessment	11
10.0	AA Screening.....	15
11.0	Water Framework Directive.....	16
12.0	Recommendation.....	16
13.0	Reasons and Considerations	16
14.0	Conditions.....	16
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19
	Appendix 2: WFD Screening	21

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This case relates to an appeal by Jimmy Campbell & Others under the provisions of Section 37 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended ('the Act'), following a grant of permission by Donegal 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 along and to the eastern side of the N56, the appeal site is located in the village of Glenties, in southwest County Donegal. The posted speed limit through the village is 50kph and the appeal site occupies a prominent position along Main Street. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of commercial and residential uses typical of a town centre with a more silvan character evident to the backland areas. The Stracashel River bisects the Main Street some 20 metres southeast of the site.
- 2.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.22ha and is irregular shaped. It consists of a mid-terrace two-storey building with commercial unit ('Siopa Lúghnasa') at ground floor and dwelling above. A linear garden area extends to the rear and rises moderately. The area between the garden and rear building line includes a yard with detached outbuilding. The commercial unit is accessed via Main Street with secondary access to the rear. The main entrance to the upper floor dwelling is via a side door accessed from the nearby alleyway which serves other properties. The subject building has a two-storey mono-pitched roof with projections to the rear. A single-storey pitched roof structure adjoins the larger flat roof projection and the adjoining property to the north.

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:

"...the construction of a rear extension to my dwelling located in the townland of Gortnamucklagh, Glenties, Co Donegal."

- 3.3. The application documents include a cover letter (Brannigan Associates, Oct. 2025). It provides a rationale for the proposed works which includes medical-related grounds.
- 3.4. The planning application form indicates that the gross floor space of the proposed works would amount to 31.30sq.m with existing floor spaces indicated as 162.50sq.m.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

- 4.1.1. Permission was granted on 11th December 2025 subject to 4 no. conditions, including:
- Condition 4 rear access to the building shall be restricted to access the residential unit at first floor level only.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 4.2.1. The assessment in the Planner's Report (08/12/25) can be summarised as follows:

Principle of Development

- Principle acceptable subject to design, residential amenity impacts etc.

Siting and Design

- Considers the proposal can integrate appropriately in the context of the site.
- Notes the wall serving the public house toilets will not be demolished.
- States that no proposed demolition works to any walls at ground floor level.
- Notes the proposal to cater for disability access including lift shaft and lobby to provide adequate access for wheelchair use.
- States that the amenity space of the residential unit / apartment at first floor level is in accordance with the relevant standards in terms of minimum amenity space.

Residential Amenity

- Does not consider the proposal will further impact upon the loss of amenity in this area, noting that a degree of sunlight and views have already been lost given the existing pattern of development of adjoining sites and within the subject site itself.
- Notes the existing rear access is via a side entrance which leads to a stairway and suggest it is not fit for purpose provided the proposed extension facilities a lift shaft.

- States that the rear access shall be conditioned ancillary to the residential unit only in the event of a grant of permission.

Access

- Does not consider the proposal constitutes an intensification of the existing access.

Public Health

- No changes proposed to the existing public connections.

Appropriate Assessment

- Excludes on the basis of objective scientific information that the development individually or in combination with other plans/projects will have a significant effect on the West of Ardara/Maas Road SAC, part of the Natura 2000 network.

Development Charges

- States that no development charges are applicable for domestic extensions.

Environmental Impact Assessment

- Excludes the need for EIA at preliminary examination stage.

Flooding

- Does not consider further flooding assessment is required given the proposed works on a brownfield site and existing development within the vicinity of the site, notwithstanding its location within Flood Zones A and B.

4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- NRDO (21/11/25) No objection.

4.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- TII (04/11/25) No objection.

4.4. **Third Party Observations**

4.4.1. The planning authority received 2 no. observations. Issues raised reflect third-party appeal grounds. Concerns, as summarised from the Planner's Report, relate to:

- Possible demolition of boundary wall with impacts on adjoining business premises.
- Ground floor foundations and roof/gutters.

- Interference with natural lighting/views to the rear.
- Holiday home use.
- Overshadowing / loss of light / privacy / residential amenity.
- Accuracy of drawings i.e., rear windows facing on to applicant's yard not shown.
- Refers to previous refusal reasons for a rear extension (PA ref. 02/2110).
- Potential for future intensification of access / further independent access.
- Alternative design solutions not considered.

5.0 Planning History

5.1. Appeal Site

- 5.1.1. PA ref. 08/30353 – in June 2008, the planning authority granted permission for retention and completion of refurbishment works to an existing outbuilding to the rear.
- 5.1.2. PA ref. 02/2110 – in January 2003, the planning authority refused permission for two apartments with associated demolition and extension of existing building. The endangerment of public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, overdevelopment of the site, impacts on residential amenity and legal entitlement were amongst the reasons.

5.2. Surrounding Area

- 5.2.1. PA ref. 15/51590 – in June 2016, the decision of the planning authority was upheld on appeal (ref. PL 05E.246273) and permission granted for a change of use to retail unit.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Local Planning Policy

County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030

- 6.1.1. The current Development Plan came into effect on 26th June 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 (Sept. 2024). The planning authority decision was made under the provisions of this current Plan.

- 6.1.2. I also note that Variation No. 1 was on public display until 13th February 2026. It proposes new Area Plans for An Clochán Liath, Bridgend, Ballyshannon, Carndonagh, Donegal Town and Killybegs, the making of various Residential Zoned Land Tax (RZLT) related zoning changes, and other minor changes to the Buncrana, Ballybofey/Stranorlar and Letterkenny Area Plans, none of which affect the site.
- 6.1.3. The site is located within the rural settlement boundary of Glenties (Map 21.21) and is subject to the provisions of Chapter 21 relating to Settlement Frameworks. In this regard, I note that the site is within the town centre with a zoning objective to sustain and strengthen the core of towns as the centres for commercial, retail, cultural and community life. It is also within a regeneration opportunity designation supported by:
- CS-O-7(c) Seeks to support economic growth throughout the County through continued support for the regeneration, renewal and development of the County's towns and villages over the life of the Plan.
- 6.1.4. Other policies and objectives are set out in chapters 5 (Towns and Villages), 6 (Housing), 11 (Natural, Built and Arch. Heritage) and 16 (Technical Standards).
- 6.1.5. The following sections are relevant to the proposed development:
- 5.2 – Prioritisation of Town and Village Cores
 - 6.2 – Urban Housing
- 6.1.6. Summary of policies and objectives relevant to the appeal site:
- TV-O-2 Seeks to ensure quality design proposals for new development within towns and villages in order to contribute to positive place-making.
- TV-P-3 Sets out criteria relating to development proposals within town and village centres. Criteria (g) seeks to utilise, where appropriate, adaptable and accessible design on the ground floor to ensure their future re-use for alternative functions (e.g., retail/commercial etc.).
- TV-P-5 Seeks to ensure that proposals make efficient use of land and do not otherwise hinder the future development potential of urban backlands.
- RH-P-9(a) Requires proposals for individual dwellings, including extensions, to be sited and designed in a manner that is sensitive to the integrity and character of rural areas as identified in Map 11.1 (Scenic Amenity) of

the Development Plan, and that enables the development to be assimilated into the receiving landscape. It notes that proposals shall be subject to the application of best practice in relation to the siting, location and design of rural housing as set out in the rural design guide.

TS-P-1 Requires compliance with all the technical standards set out in Chapter 16 of the Plan including those relating to transportation and parking.

6.2. National Planning Policy and Guidelines

Development Management Guidelines

- 6.2.1. Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines (DEHLG, 2007) states that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land and this is ultimately a matter for resolution in the Courts. In this regard, it notes that a person is not entitled solely by reason of a permission to carry out any development as per Section 34(13) of the Planning Act.
- 6.2.2. It also states that where in making an application, a person asserts ownership, and there is nothing to cast doubt on the *bona fides* of that assertion, the planning authority is not required to inquire further into the matter. If, however, the terms of the application or a third-party submission raises doubts as to the sufficiency of the legal interest, further information may have to be sought under Article 33 of the Regulations.
- 6.2.3. Whilst the Guidelines also state that permission should be refused where it is clear from the further information response that the applicant does not have sufficient legal interest, they go on to suggest that the planning authority may still grant permission where some doubt remains, confident in the knowledge that Section 34(13) prevails.

6.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 6.3.1. Nearest proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA):
- West of Ardara/Maas Road pNHA (000197) – c. 0.77km southwest
- 6.3.2. Nearest Natura 2000 sites:
- West of Ardara/Maas Road SAC (000197) – overlapping (c. 25m from works)
 - Lough Nillan Bog SPA (004110) – c. 1.55km south

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. A third-party appeal has been lodged by Jimmy Campbell & Others. The appeal grounds reflect the observations made to the Council and are summarised as follows:

- Suggests that the ground floor wall is in their ownership.
- States that their business premises will have to close during construction as the demolition of the boundary wall will require the adjoining toilets to be demolished.
- Objects to the foundations, roof section and gutters on their property, including the plastering of the new wall.
- Completely opposes the demolition of the boundary wall.
- Suggests that the proposal will impact on their patrons during the daytime by reason of overshadowing / loss of light of their outdoor space.
- States that the proposal will impact on views to the rear.
- Outlines the refusal reasons under PA ref. 02/2110.
- States that the applicant uses the property as a holiday apartment.
- Notes that legal action will be taken upon commencement of the works.
- Suggests that there is no justification for a wheelchair lift.

8.2. Applicant Response

8.2.1. Brannigan Associates responded on behalf of the applicant, Thadeus Boyle. It includes a set of revised drawings in addition to documentary evidence in respect of the applicant's wife's reduced mobility. The response can be summarised as follows:

- States that the appellant's main issue relates to the demolition of the party boundary wall and confirms that this is not now required, nor will it be altered etc.
- Notes the existing external wall is constructed independently inside the party wall, within the applicant's landholding, and this will be vertically extended instead.
- States that the toilets of the commercial premises will not be demolished or altered.
- Notes that the foundations are existing and will not encroach onto neighbouring property and the roof and gutters will not overhang the neighbours property.
- States that the applicant is happy to provide a render finish to the external wall if access is made available to them.
- Notes the rear yard of the commercial premises is open and exposed to daylight.
- States that there is no obligation to provide views to the seating area.
- Notes that the previous application (PA ref. 02/2110) was for a completely different development and irrelevant to the proposal but notes that there is no intensification of traffic and the proposal is significantly smaller in scale and nature, nonetheless.
- States that the type of occupancy is irrelevant to the proposal.
- States that the applicant's wife has severe mobility issues and the proposed development is the only practical method to facilitate independent access.

8.3. Planning Authority Response

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

- Majority of the matters raised have been addressed in the Planner's Report.
- Expresses a view that the decision to grant permission should be upheld.

8.4. Further Response

8.4.1. A further response was received from the appellant's, Jimmy Campbell & Others. It includes an extract from land registry mapping with the existing boundary wall overlaid and illustrated within their folio. The response can be summarised as follows:

- States that the proposed drawings do not match up with what is on the ground.
- Reiterates the majority of the grounds of appeal (see section 8.1.1).

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:

- Procedural Matters
- Other Issues

9.2. **Procedural Matters**

9.2.1. The crux of this appeal revolves around the legal interest or ownership of the party boundary wall to the rear of the property. The appellants claim that the entire wall is in their ownership whereas the applicant submits that the wall will not now be altered.

9.2.2. In this regard, I note that to facilitate the proposed extension, which will accommodate a wheelchair lift, the existing single-storey projection will be extended further to the rear at ground floor level (8.5sq.m) with a first-floor extension above the combined footprint (22.8sq.m). The existing first floor window above the single-storey projection will be removed and double doors installed to provide access between the lift shaft and living room. The area in between the living room and lift shaft is illustrated as a lobby. It will be open plan with the existing kitchen, which is accommodated within the flat roof projection given part of the external wall will be demolished. The adjoining bedroom within the flat roof projection will be unaltered save for the installation of frosted glazing to the side window. I note that the rear facing bedroom window will also be unaltered.

9.2.3. I also note that at ground floor level, an existing toilet window, which serves the commercial unit, will be blocked up and mechanical ventilation provided in lieu. Externally, the existing flat roof structure will be removed and replaced with a pitched roof structure over the existing and extended areas. Above the lift shaft area which extends beyond the rear wall of the flat roof projection will be a smaller pitched roof.

9.2.4. Whilst a note on the permitted drawings states that the 'existing boundary wall will be demolished down to first floor level and reconstructed in blockwork to form the external

wall of the proposed extension', the drawings submitted with the applicant's appeal response illustrate that this is no longer the case. The external wall is now to be constructed independently inside the party wall and extended vertically; all to be within the applicant's landholding. In this regard, the appellant was offered the opportunity to respond under Section 131 of the Act. In doing so, they included an extract from land registry mapping which shows the boundary wall overlaid and within their folio.

- 9.2.5. As noted, Section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines provides that a planning authority is not obliged to inquire further into the *bona fides* of asserted ownership where there is nothing to cast doubt on that assertion. Further information may be sought, however, if a third-party submission raises doubts as to the sufficiency of the legal interest. Whilst the Guidelines also state that permission should be refused where it is clear from the further information response that the applicant does not have sufficient legal interest, they go on to suggest that the planning authority may still grant permission where some doubt remains, fully confident in the knowledge that Section 34(13) of the Planning Act prevails i.e., a person shall not be entitled solely by reason of a permission under Section 34 of the Planning Act to carry out the development.
- 9.2.6. Whilst there may have been some merit in the appellant's concerns regarding the demolition of the upper part of the boundary wall and the applicant's legal interest to execute same, this is no longer proposed. It is clear from the drawings submitted with the appeal response that the proposed extension will be on lands within the applicant's control and in this regard, they state that the roof and gutters will not overhang the neighbour's property. Similarly, I note that the applicant is willing to render the external part of the new wall that extends above the existing if access is made available to them.

Conclusion on Procedural Matters

- 9.2.7. Legal disputes are a civil matter outside the scope of the appeal process, and whilst I am cognisant of the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Act, I am, on balance, satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated sufficient legal interest to implement the amended proposal. If the Commission are minded to grant planning permission, I recommend that it is the amended scheme received with the appeal response that is conditioned.

9.3. Other Issues

- 9.3.1. As noted, the appellant's submission suggest that the proposal lacks justification and will have an amenity impact, whilst also referring to a previous refusal (PA ref 02/2110).

9.3.2. I am also conscious that Condition 4 of the Council's decision states that "rear access to the building shall be restricted to access the residential unit at first floor level only."

Justification

9.3.3. Whilst justification for a residential extension would not normally be required, particularly for the modest 31.30sq.m proposed, I note that the applicant's appeal response includes documentary evidence in relation to his wife's reduced mobility. It is stated that the proposal is the only practical method to facilitate independent access.

9.3.4. The proposed floor plans evidently include a lift shaft and I note that the main entrance to the upper floor dwelling is via a side door and internal stairway. There is nothing in the proposal before me to suggest that it is anything other than to facilitate access and whether that access is to permanent or holiday accommodation is wholly immaterial so long as the existing dwelling and extension are jointly occupied as a single unit.

Amenity Impact

9.3.5. The appellant also suggests that the proposal will impact on their patrons during the daytime by reason of overshadowing and loss of light of their outdoor space, adding that the proposed development will adversely impact on existing views to the rear.

9.3.6. The applicant, on the other hand, notes that the rear yard of the commercial premises is open and exposed to daylight and there is no obligation to provide views thereof.

9.3.7. Whilst a section of external wall will extend above the lower part of the existing boundary wall, it's impact on amenity will be marginal in terms of overshadowing and loss of light given the orientation of the buildings and path of the sun. As noted, the applicant is willing to render this section of wall if access is provided and I do not consider any amenity impacts will arise nor will the proposal affect any existing views.

Previous Refusal

9.3.8. Finally, the appellant refers to the refusal reasons outlined under PA ref. 02/2110. I note that it related to a proposal for two apartments to the rear of the premises and in addition to legal entitlement, the reasons related to the endangerment of public safety by reason of a traffic hazard, overdevelopment and impacts on residential amenity.

9.3.9. The applicant, on the other hand, states that the previous proposal was for an entirely different development and irrelevant to the current proposal but notes that there is no intensification of traffic and it is significantly smaller in scale and nature, nonetheless.

9.3.10. As noted, I am satisfied that the proposal will not impact on the amenity of the area and will evidently not result in any increase in traffic or overdevelopment of the site. It, as noted by the applicant, is distinguishable from the previous refusal in this regard.

Condition No. 4 – New Issue

9.3.11. As noted, Condition 4 restricts the rear access to serve the residential unit at first floor level only. In this regard, Section 9.6 of the Planner's Report states that the:

"... existing rear access to the residential unit is via a side entrance which leads to an existing stairway. Provided that the proposed extension facilities [sic.] a lift shaft, the existing access is not fit for purpose. In the event of a grant of permission, it shall be conditioned that rear access shall be ancillary to the residential unit only."

9.3.12. Whilst I accept that the side entrance is to the upper floor residential unit, it also provides ground floor access to the commercial unit. I also note that the existing rear entrance is to the commercial unit (storeroom). It was through that doorway that I accessed the rear of the premises during my site visit. It is unclear from the report and the wording of the condition, however, which existing entrance 'is not fit for purpose'.

9.3.13. The unintended consequences of the condition, in my opinion, would effectively render the rear entrance to the commercial premises unusable i.e., rear access to the building shall be restricted to access the residential unit at first floor level. In such circumstances, I recommend that the Commission do not attach such a condition, nor am I convinced that any similar condition to restrict access in this fashion is warranted.

9.3.14. Other conditions in respect of surface water and finishes are, however, recommended, in addition to conditions controlling the construction hours and use of the extension.

Conclusion on Other Issues

9.3.15. The above assessment represents my *de novo* consideration of all planning issues material to the proposed development for a small-scale residential extension.

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-500553-DL-26 in light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

The proposed development is located within a mixed-use urban area and comprises a minor, 31.30sq.m, extension to the rear of a two-storey terraced building (with residential use at first floor) together with minimal demolition to facilitate such works.

The closest European site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, West of Ardara/Maas Road SAC (000197), partly overlaps the appeal site at the wooded area to the rear. It is, however, c. 25m from the proposed works site which is enclosed by other buildings. Lough Nillan Bog SPA (004110) is located c. 1.55km south of the site.

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 and built form, 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 County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030, the location of the proposed development within the settlement boundary of Glenties, in the village centre, 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, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by An Coimisiún Pleanála on the 9th day of January 2026, 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. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

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

9th April 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500553-DL-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a rear extension to dwelling
Development Address	Main Street, (Gortnamucklagh Td.) Glenties, Co. Donegal
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-500553-DL-26	Townland, address	Main Street (Gortnamucklagh Td.), Glenties, Co. Donegal
Description of project	Construction of a rear extension to dwelling.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening	<p>Irregular shaped brownfield site with street frontage and a stated area of 0.22ha.</p> <p>Mid-terrace two-storey building at c. 100.2mTBM towards its western extent and marginally above road (N56) level. Stracashel River some 20 metres to the southeast.</p> <p>Site situated within an established mixed-use town centre 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)
River Waterbody	c. 20m southeast	STRACASHEL_02 0 IE_NW_38S010 200	Moderate	At risk	Forestry	No –stormwater outfalls public sewer / drain.
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Northwest Donegal IE_NW_G_049	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) during construction phase only.

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	Northwest Donegal IE_NW_G_04 9	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.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

DECOMMISSIONING PHASE

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

This page is intentionally left blank.