



## Inspector's Report

**PL-500593-DL-26**

<b>Development</b>	Change of house design of previously approved planning permission (planning ref. No. 22/50887 refers).
<b>Location</b>	Drumacadoo, Churchill, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Donegal County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2561788
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Sarah Sweeney
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission + Conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Michael Dollard
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> March 2026
<b>Inspector</b>	Terence McLellan

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site is located in the rural townland of Drumacanoo and has a stated area of c. 0.26 hectares. There is an open drain along the site frontage onto the L-1562-1 local road which provides connections to the R251 regional road approximately 200m to the north-east. The site is a regularly shaped plot orientated north-west and is part of a larger landholding controlled by the Applicant. There are several two storey one-off dwellings in the immediate area, including on the immediately neighbouring sites to the north-east and south-west. Site levels undulate across the site, with a general fall in levels from west to east. I note that land around and beyond the eastern and southern site boundaries was, in parts, waterlogged and boggy at the time of my visit. Other land within the site was otherwise generally dry and firm under foot.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for an amendment to the house design permitted under planning permission reference 22/50887 (the parent permission). The proposed changes include:

- The single storey side element of the permitted scheme has been removed.
- Reduction in the size of the front porch and change in materials including extending the use of natural dry stone across the entrance and to the side elevation with wrap around.
- General fenestration changes to all elevations.
- Internal reconfiguration (no change to the number of bedrooms).
- Reduction in ridge height from 8.32m permitted to 7.95m proposed.
- Reduction in overall dwelling size from 217sqm permitted to 199sqm proposed.

2.2. No other changes are proposed to the parent permission, and the development would remain as permitted in all other respects, including in terms of siting, access, drainage, and wastewater treatment.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

3.1.1. Permission was granted by Donegal County Council by order dated 5<sup>th</sup> December 2025, subject to 17 conditions. The conditions replicate those imposed on the parent permission with the exception of Condition 17 which relates to Section 48 development contributions. This condition has been amended to account for the reduction in the size of the permitted dwelling and the consequent reduction in the applicable contribution.

#### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. The Planner's Report contains the following points of note:

- The principle of development has been accepted under the parent permission (Ref. 22/50887) which was granted to the same applicant. Any permission will be tied to the parent permission which expires on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2027.
- No residential amenity issues are anticipated.
- Access would remain as permitted.
- Surface and storm water drainage would remain as permitted and conditioned.
- The same number of bedrooms are proposed as the permitted dwelling and there would be no additional loading on the wastewater treatment system which would remain as permitted and conditioned.
- Development contributions are reduced to account for the reduction in the overall floorspace of the proposed dwelling.

#### **3.3. Other Technical Reports**

3.3.1. The Area Roads Engineer was consulted but no response was received.

#### **3.4. Prescribed Bodies**

3.4.1. Various prescribed bodies were consulted by the Planning Authority, but no responses were received. This includes An Taisce, The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, The Heritage Council, and Uisce Éireann.

### 3.5. **Third Party Observations**

3.5.1. One observation was received in response to the planning application (from the Appellant). The issues raised are reflected in the grounds of appeal which are set out in detail in Section 7 below.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

### *Subject Site*

4.1. There is a detailed planning history available for the site, including various applications for a dwelling (both approved and refused) dating back from 2001 up to the parent permission in 2022. I have considered the detailed planning history set out in the Planner's Report. Given the very specific nature of the proposed development, which seeks amendments to a permitted development, and having regard to the nature of those proposed amendments, I consider the wider planning history to be of limited relevance to the appeal. The parent application/permission would therefore be the most pertinent to the proposal and is set out below:

4.2. **Planning Authority reference 22/50887**: Permission was granted by Donegal County Council in August 2022 for the erection of a dwellinghouse with wastewater treatment system and domestic garage, including all other associated site development works.

4.3. I note that the Commission refused the current Appellant leave to appeal this decision on the basis that it was not shown that the development would differ materially from the development as set out in the application for permission by reasons of conditions imposed by the Planning Authority.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030**

- 5.1.1. The site is located within a ‘Structurally Weak Rural Area’ and an ‘Area of High Scenic Amenity’. High scenic amenity is described as: *Landscapes of significant aesthetic, cultural, heritage and environmental quality that are unique to their locality and form a fundamental element of the landscape and identity of Co. Donegal. These areas have the capacity to absorb sensitively located development of scale, design and use that will enable assimilation into the receiving landscape and which does not detract from the quality of the landscape, subject to compliance with all other objectives and policies of the plan’.*
- 5.1.2. L-P-2: To protect areas identified as ‘High Scenic Amenity’ and ‘Moderate Scenic Amenity’ on Map 11.1 ‘Scenic Amenity’. Within these areas only development of a nature, location and scale that integrates with, and reflects the character and amenity of the landscape may be considered, subject to compliance with other relevant policies of the Plan.
- 5.1.3. Chapter 6 contains the housing policies. Relevant policies and objectives include:
- RH-O-4: To ensure that rural housing is located, designed and constructed in a manner that does not detract from the character or quality of the receiving landscape having particular regard to Map 11.1: ‘Scenic Amenity’ of this Plan.
  - RH-P-3: To consider proposals for new one-off housing within ‘Structurally Weak Rural Areas’ from any prospective applicants for a dwelling house, subject to siting and design considerations and compliance with all other relevant policies of this Plan including Policy RH-P-9. New holiday homes will not be permitted in these areas.
  - RH-P-9: (a) Proposals for individual dwellings (including refurbishment, replacement and/or extension projects) shall 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 this Plan, and that enables the development to be assimilated into the receiving landscape. 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 Donegal County Council’s ‘Rural Housing Location, Siting and Design Guide’. In applying these principles, the Council will be guided by the following considerations:

- i. A proposed dwelling shall avoid the creation or expansion of a suburban pattern of development in the rural area.
  - ii. A proposed dwelling shall not create or add to ribbon development (see definitions).
  - iii. A proposed dwelling shall not result in a development which by its positioning, siting or location would be detrimental to the amenity of the area or of other rural dwellers or would constitute haphazard development.
  - iv. A proposed dwelling will be unacceptable where it is prominent in the landscape.
  - v. A proposed new dwelling will be unacceptable where it fails to blend with the landform, existing trees or vegetation, buildings, slopes or other natural features which can help its integration. Proposals for development involving extensive or significant excavation or infilling will not normally be favourably considered nor will proposals that result in the removal of trees or wooded areas beyond that necessary to accommodate the development. The extent of excavation that may be considered will depend upon the circumstances of the case, including the extent to which the development of the proposed site, including necessary site works, will blend in unobtrusively with its immediate and wider surroundings.
- b) Proposals for individual dwellings shall also be assessed against the following criteria:
- i. The need to avoid any adverse impact on Natura 2000 sites or other designated habitats of conservation importance, prospects or views including views covered by Policy L-P-8.
  - ii. The need to avoid any negative impacts on protected areas defined by the River Basin District Plan in place at the time.
  - iii. The site access/egress being configured in a manner that does not constitute a hazard to road users or significantly scar the landscape.

- iv. The safe and efficient disposal of effluent and surface waters in a manner that does not pose a risk to public health and accords with Environmental Protection Agency codes of practice.
  - v. Compliance with the flood risk management policies of this Plan.
- c) In the event of a grant of permission the Council will attach an Occupancy condition which may require the completion of a legal agreement under S47 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

5.1.4. Chapter 11 contains policies and objectives regarding natural, built and archaeological heritage. Relevant policies include:

- BIO-P-1: To require all developments to comply with the requirements of the EU Habitats Directive and EU Bird Directive, including ensuring that development proposals:
  - a) Do not adversely affect the integrity of any European/Natura 2000 site (i.e. Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas) including effects on ex-situ but functionally linked habitats, and species (e.g. Pearl Mussel) save where a plan must be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI).
  - b) Provide for the protection of animal and plant species listed in Annex IV of the EU Habitats Directive and the Flora Protection Order.
  - c) Protect and enhance features of the landscape (such as rivers, riverbanks, field boundaries, ponds and small woods) which are of major importance for wild fauna and flora and the ecological coherence of the Natura 2000 network.

5.1.5. Rural Housing Location, Siting and Design Guide 2024-2030.

## 5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.2.1. The site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any European Sites. The nearest European Site is the Leannan River SAC (site code: 002176) which is c. 320m to the north.

## 6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. 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.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. A Third Party appeal has been received from Michael Dollard (neighbouring site to the north-east). The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The decision to grant permission to the parent permission (22/50887) made no reference to the previous applications on which observations were submitted outlining amenity concerns.
- Some documents on historical applications are not available online.
- The Site Suitability report on the parent permission refers to a three bedroom house when the proposal was for a four bedroom house with office.
- The current proposal is for a four bedroom house and a condition of the parent permission has been re-applied requiring a WWTS with a PE of 6 to be installed even though the site suitability report for the parent consent was based on a three bedroom house.
- A previous Site Sanitary Report from 2001 for the same location as the current application noted a high-water table and poor percolation.
- Permission was refused in 2003 as satisfactory treatment of effluent could not be guaranteed. Soil conditions have not changed, and permission should have been refused in 2022 and 2025.

- Health and safety would be jeopardised by foul effluent from the subject site entering ground water and contaminated surface water.
- Run off from the site, which is permanently waterlogged and boggy, makes the Appellant's garden waterlogged.
- Trial holes on the 2022 Site Suitability Assessment are not shown. The photos in the SSA and location of trial holes shown on plan are contradictory. The test was not undertaken in an area adjacent to the proposed infiltration/treatment area and the SSA is not in compliance with the Code of Practice of the EPA.
- The Planner's Reports on the 2025 and 2022 permission do not give any consideration to the inaccurate information in the 2022 permission's SSA in terms of the location of the trial holes.
- No consideration has been given to the submissions made under 21/51838 which highlighted the inaccurate information in the SSA, including the presence of a spring well.
- No reference is made to the permission for the Appellant's house. Documents on this application made reference to a spring well. The spring well is not referenced in any documents or drawings on either the parent application, the current application, or similar applications from 2021. The well extends into the subject site, encompassing the location of the proposed treatment plant and percolation area.
- Concerns are raised regarding potential sewage, surface water run-off,<sup>0</sup> and effluent seepage in groundwater.
- 22/50887 and 21/51838 were applied for at the same time with the same supporting documents. The Appellant submitted an observation on 21/51838 but did not submit an observation on 22/50887 as they were not aware of it. 21/51838 was withdrawn and 22/50887 was approved, but no consideration was given to the submission made by the Appellant on 21/51838 in the assessment of 22/50887.
- It is not clear why the Planner's Report on 22/50887 considered some previous applications in the site history (03/0783) but omitted others (04/0787). While the

applications were referenced in the current application, it is not clear if they were reviewed in the decision process.

- The Planning Application Form states that the Applicant/Agent is not aware of any valid applications previously made on the site.
- The Commission refused permission in 2005 for a dwelling on a site c. 60m from the subject site. A subsequent application was then permitted by Donegal County Council despite the previous refusal.
- Concerns are raised regarding the discharge of surface water to the roadside open drain as approved on 22/50887. There is no information in terms of volumes or how it would be managed. This could lead to water flowing onto the road. This could worsen existing instances of ice and present a traffic hazard.
- The previous permission was granted subject to a condition which restricts use and occupation under S47. The Applicant has attempted to sell the land with planning permission. This indicates that the condition will not be adhered to.

## **7.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Appeal**

7.2.1. A First Party response has been received from Michael Friel Architects and Surveyors Ltd, for and on behalf of the Applicant, Sarah Sweeney.

- The principal of a house being permitted on this site has existed since 2001 (Planning Ref: 01/7028).
- Permission was granted to the Applicant in 2022 under 22/50887 for the erection of a dwelling with WWTS and domestic garage. That permission exists and is still valid.
- The matter under consideration is whether the Applicant builds the house they have permission for under 22/50887 or whether they build the revised design under 25/61788.
- The revisions seek to make the house more user friendly to the Applicant's needs and the revised design is for a smaller house that would be less impactful on neighbouring third parties like the Appellant.

- The Applicant will erect a house on the site. Whether it is the design previously permitted or the revised design will depend on the decision of the Commission.
- The matter at hand is what design will be built out, not the principle of a house on the site, which has been established and for which an existing permission is in place.
- Acknowledge that the site characterisation report for the granted house refers to 3 double bedrooms with a PE of 5 when it should have had a PE of 6. The specification will be updated to a PE of 6, the percolation area is suitable for this. This is conditioned.
- The application is to allow for a change in the house design only.
- The main issues raised in the appeal relate to matters on the existing permission 22/50887 which has been decided and cannot be challenged.

### **7.3. Planning Authority Response**

- 7.3.1. The Planning Authority consider that all matters raised in the appeal have previously been addressed in the Planner's Report and the Council wish to rely on the content of same in response to this appeal.

### **7.4. Observations**

- 7.4.1. None received.

## **8.0 Assessment**

- 8.1. At the outset I would note that all of the substantive points raised by the Appellant relate to matters corresponding to the parent permission, including matters relating to drainage, wastewater treatment, accuracy of documentation, and queries/concerns relating to the Planning Authority's assessment and other procedural issues. The proposed amendments relate solely to the facades of the permitted dwelling and its internal configuration. In all other respects, the development would remain as permitted.

- 8.2. The parent permission remains legally valid. As established by legal precedent, parts of the development that remain as permitted are considered to be settled matters and it is only the proposed amendments/revisions that are to be assessed. As such, and whilst acknowledging the entirety of the Appellant's submission and the merit of the points raised, I consider that issues relating to drainage, wastewater treatment, and site suitability are settled matters. Further issues raised regarding the accuracy of the documentation on the parent permission and other procedural issues in the determination of that application are not matters for the Commission in the determination of the current appeal.
- 8.3. Given that those elements of the development that are not being modified or varied, and which have the benefit of planning permission should not be revisited, I am satisfied that the role of the Commission in this instance is to consider the specific amendments proposed and whether they would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 8.4. In this respect I note that the Appellant does not raise any specific issues with regards to the proposed design amendments. I consider that the design amendments sought would largely be non-material in nature and entirely acceptable in planning terms. The more significant changes, such as the removal of the single storey side element and the alterations to the porch are still fairly minor in the context of the permitted development and do not alter my opinion that the overall design, scale and massing of the dwelling would remain acceptable. I note that the height and the overall footprint of the dwelling would reduce, albeit noting that the siting would remain as permitted. The materials proposed would be consistent with the existing permission and appropriate to the rural area. The internal reconfigurations do not alter the permitted number of bedrooms. The proposed amendments do not introduce any new amenity issues, nor would they result in the intensification of any amenity impacts. In my opinion, the proposed amendments are acceptable.

#### *Conditions*

- 8.5. In respect of conditions, I note that the parent permission was subject to 17 conditions. The Planning Authority have reapplied these conditions as previously imposed except for Condition 17 (Section 48 Contributions) which was amended to account for the reduction in the size of the permitted dwelling and the consequent reduction in the

applicable contribution. Although I consider the issues raised by the Appellant to be settled in the context of the parent permission, for clarity I would note that the matter of the PE capacity of the WWTS (PE of 6 required), was addressed by condition on the parent permission and this has been reimposed on the current proposal. Furthermore, whilst I acknowledge the Appellant's concern that the Applicant may seek to sell the site with permission, the development is subject to a Section 47 condition (both on the parent permission and reimposed on the current proposal) and I note that the DAFT advert provided by the Appellant makes clear to potential purchasers that the site is subject to Section 47 restrictions. In any event, the condition would still apply and compliance with same would be a matter for the Planning Authority.

## 9.0 **AA Screening**

- 9.1. I have considered the proposal in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in the townland of Drumacanoo, at a distance of approximately 320m from the Leannan River SAC (site code; 002176) which is the closest European Site. Planning permission is sought for amendments to the design of the dwelling permitted under planning reference 22/50887. This parent permission was screened for Appropriate Assessment and the Planning Authority concluded that the development would not have a negative effect on any European Sites either by itself or in combination with other developments.
- 9.2. The proposed amendments relate to minor changes to the façade design. The overall dwelling would be reduced in size, and the number of bedrooms would remain as permitted. With the exception of the proposed façade amendments and internal reconfiguration, the development would remain as permitted, including in terms of drainage and wastewater treatment. Having considered the very specific nature of the proposed development, which relates solely to façade design amendments and internal reconfiguration, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because the amendments sought in the appeal could not have any effect on a European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature and scale of the proposed works and the fact that no new pathways would be created by the amendments, nor would there be any increased loading on the WWTS or changes in hydrology which would all remain as permitted.

- The screening determination of the Planning Authority on both the parent permission and the current appeal.

9.3. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The proposal before the Commission is for amendments to the design of the dwelling permitted under planning reference 22/50887. As set out previously, the amendments relate to minor changes to the façade design and some minor internal reconfiguration, with the number of bedrooms remaining as permitted. With the exception of the proposed façade amendments and internal reconfiguration, the development would remain as permitted, including in terms of drainage and wastewater treatment. I have considered the development against the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.2. Whilst noting the issues raised by the Appellant regarding drainage, wastewater treatment, and site suitability, the proposal is solely for detailed design amendments to the façade of the approved dwelling in addition to internal reconfiguration. As set out previously, all matters relating to siting, drainage, and wastewater remain as approved on the parent application which is legally valid. As such, having considered the very specific nature of the proposal, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because the specific design amendments sought pose no risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.3. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed design amendments will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## 11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that the Commission grant planning permission for the proposed amendments.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the parent permission, the location of the subject site within a 'Structurally Weak Rural Area', the nature and scale of the proposed development and of existing development in the area, and the policies of the current development plan, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health and would otherwise be acceptable in terms of design, amenity, and traffic safety. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted with the planning application, except as may be otherwise required by the following conditions.

**Reason:** To clarify the plans and particulars for which permission is granted.

2. Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall strictly comply with the conditions of the parent permission (Register Reference 22/50887) unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission, which for the avoidance of doubt is the 30<sup>th</sup> day of August 2027.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission.

3. The developer shall pay to the Planning Authority a financial contribution of €1,174.53 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.

**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.

---

Terence McLellan

Senior Planning Inspector

16<sup>th</sup> April 2026

### Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500593-DL-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Change of house design of previously approved planning permission (planning ref. No. 22/50887 refers).
<b>Development Address</b>	Drumacanoo, Churchill, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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)	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.  <b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b> <b>OR</b>	Class 10 (b) (i), threshold >500 dwellings.

<b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b>	
<b>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b>	
<b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b>

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

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> April 2026

## Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500593-DL-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Change of house design of previously approved planning permission (planning ref. No. 22/50887 refers).
<b>Development Address</b>	Drumacanoo, Churchill, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal.
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<p><b>Characteristics of proposed development</b></p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p><b>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</b></p> <p>The development is for residential on a site where residential is permitted and where neighbouring sites are in residential use.</p> <p>No demolition works are required. Construction materials and activities will be typical for a residential development of this nature and scale.</p> <p>The use of fuels and materials would be typical for such construction projects and impacts would be local and temporary in nature, given standard construction techniques, methods and best practice.</p> <p>In terms of accidents, no significant risk is anticipated having regard to the nature and scale of the development. Any risk arising from construction would be localised and temporary in nature.</p> <p>No existing or permitted developments have been identified in the immediate vicinity that would give rise to significant cumulative environmental effects with the subject project.</p>

<p><b>Location of development</b> (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><b>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</b></p> <p>The development would align with the nature of the locality having regard to landscape sensitivities. The works proposed would have no significant impact on any protected areas, protected views, built or natural heritage or European Sites.</p>
<p><b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b></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><b>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</b></p> <p>All development has the potential for some impacts/disturbance during the construction phase such as noise, vibration, dust, air quality and traffic. However, these impacts would be small scale, short term and temporary.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	

<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>
<b>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>	<b>EIA is not required.</b>

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

**Date:** 16<sup>th</sup> April 2026