



Development	Permission to construct a 3-storey apartment building comprising of 38 no. residential units and all associated works.
Location	Lands known as Glasshouse Commercial Site, Radharc na Gréine, Monivea Road Galway.
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560072
Applicant(s)	Green Way Estates (Leitrim) Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Green Way Estates (Leitrim) Limited
Observer(s)	Marie Murray
Date of Site Inspection	30 th March 2026
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	5
4.0	Planning History	12
5.0	Policy Context.....	14
6.0	Natural Heritage Designations	26
7.0	EIA Screening.....	27
8.0	Water Framework Directive Screening.....	27
9.0	The Appeal	27
10.0	Assessment	31
11.0	Recommendation	57
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	57
13.0	Conditions.....	58

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 2 - Screening for Appropriate Assessment

Appendix 3 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site, with a stated area of c. 0.311ha, is located on the south side of the Monivea Road (R339) in the Mervue area within the northeastern suburbs of Galway City (c. 2.5km from the city centre). The environs of the site are comprised of a mix of residential, enterprise, commercial and industrial land uses with development on both sides of the R339 at this location maintaining a setback from the roadside boundary. The public road in the vicinity of the site is wide, with pavements on both sides.
- 1.2. The site is adjoined by 2-3 storey dwellings of the Radharc na Gréine housing estate to the south, west and south-east, and by a detached 2-storey dwelling to the north-east. There is large-scale redevelopment currently ongoing within a designated neighbourhood centre on the Crown Square site to the north-west of the site where mixed use development of c. 3 to 9 storeys has recently been permitted. The former 'Eir' complex is located on the opposite side of the Monivea Road to the north-east of the site and comprises of buildings of 2 to 7 storeys sited at offset angles to the road.
- 1.3. The rectangular site is brownfield in nature and appears to be in use as a depot for the storage of construction materials and machinery. It is enclosed on three sides by palisade fencing, with a blockwork boundary wall forming its eastern boundary. The site is served by a single vehicular access off the access road serving Radharc na Gréine is located on its north-west side

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development on a site of c. 0.311ha is for a residential apartment scheme comprising:
 - a) the construction of a 3-storey apartment building (c. 2,457.8 sq.m GFA, with a max. height of c. 11.37m above adjacent ground level) comprising of c. 38 no. units (20 no. one-bed and 18 no. two-bed units), a common laundry room, plant room, roof garden with heat pump units, a lift, and an internal open-air atrium/courtyard with raingarden in the centre of the perimeter apartment block;

- b) vehicular and bicycle parking (60 no. bicycle parking spaces and 25 no. car parking spaces (incl. 2 no. for wheelchair accessible use) of which 9 no. spaces are within the existing car park (c. 110 sqm) adjoining the site to the west);
- c) pedestrian and vehicular access through the existing vehicle and pedestrian entrances via the existing Radharc na Greine road network as consented under Pl. Ref. 22/221 (commercial building of 2786 sq.m GFA); and,
- d) all associated site works including site clearance, boundary treatment, associated external lighting, internal pathways, storage rooms, bin stores, hard and soft landscaping and roof-mounted photovoltaic solar panels.
- 2.2. Further Information (FI) stage changes comprised of a reduction in the number of apartment units proposed from 38 no. to 36 no. and a change in their unit mix profile to provide for 16 no. 1-beds, 18 no. 2-beds and 2 no. 3-beds. Related changes were also made to the design and elevations of the proposed apartment building and to the design/ layout of the scheme's roof level in order to provide for a landscaped roof garden. A setback was also provided along the Monivea Road to allow for the provision of 2m wide cycle lane and 2m wide footpath, with new seating areas and a kick-about space introduced at grade within the site.
- 2.3. Clarification of FI stage changes provided for redesigned floor plans and elevations for the 1st and 2nd floor levels of north-eastern façade; for the replacement of obscured glazed & fixed shut windows on the north east elevation with clear opening windows; replacement of a 2m void on the north-eastern elevation with balconies; and, the provision of additional details in respect to scheme landscaping and maintenance.
- 2.4. Documentation provided at PA stage included: a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA), Mobility Management Plan (MMP), a Parking Management Strategy, Engineering Services Report, Stage 1 Storm Water Management Audit, Daylight and Sunlight Assessment, Outdoor Lighting Report, Landscape Design Report, Noise Impact Assessment, Scheme Sustainability Statement, AA Screening Report, Planning Report, Schedule of Accommodation and full suite of existing and proposed plans.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 18/12/2025 subject to 24 no. conditions, generally of a standard technical nature, with conditions of note being as follows:

- No. 2 – omission in full of nine (9 no.) proposed apartment units along the south-western section of the apartment building with the remaining land being dedicated and landscaped as part of the internal open air courtyard garden for the benefit of apartment residents.
- No. 3 – requirement to enlarge the size of proposed internal courtyard kitchen windows of apartments while ensuring no direct overlooking between opposing kitchen windows.
- No. 20 – setback area between proposed new boundary and existing footpath in order to facilitate future road works on the Monivea Road.

I note that conditions no's 2 and 3 relate to the first party appeal.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Planner's Report (23/04/2025) – Initial Application Stage

- *Principle of Development* – site specific development objective allows for consideration of residential development on full extent of lands where its height & density aligns with that of Radharc na Gréine. Site specific planning history establishes acceptability of proposed height, scale & massing etc. on the site, with principle of proposal being in line with the Apartment & Compact Settlement Guidelines and GCDP infill, urban consolidation & densification policy.
- *Density* – 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines' Table 3.2 allows for urban range of 50 – 200 dph (net) in Galway, proposed density of 122dph is compliant with same.

- *Height* – 3-storey proposal is compliant with Section 18.3 (Galway City Urban Density and Building Heights Study) of GCDP and in line with previous permission.
- *Private Amenity Space* – clarity required on design and height of balcony railings etc. **Further Information** sought.
- *Design* – concerns raised regarding void feature (between units' no's 21 & 22 and no's 34 & 35) at the south-eastern corner of building re: management and function – to be omitted. **Further Information** sought.
- *Residential Standards* – PA satisfied that proposal complies with minimum standards re: internal storage, waste storage, floor areas/ widths for living/dining rooms and bedrooms and minimum aggregate floors for living/dining/kitchen rooms and bedrooms and floor to ceiling heights. Issue of percentage of 1-bed apartments (over 50%) not compliant with 2023 Apartment Guidelines. **Further Information** sought.
- *Private Amenity Space* – proposal is fully compliant with standards of Guidelines.
- *Communal Open Space* – quantitative requirement is met by central courtyard and roof garden. A designated recreational facility has not been provided in compliance with GCDP S. 11.3.1. **Further Information** sought.
- *Residential Quality* – PA have significant concerns about north-eastern apartment units no's 21, 22, 34 and 35 on basis of the proposal for obscure windows serving habitable rooms which are fixed shut and will not provide for ventilation, fire egress or adequate natural light. **Further Information** sought.
- *Daylight & Sunlight* – submitted Daylight & Sunlight Analysis finds that all apartments, proposed rooftop amenity area and adjoining residential properties will meet internal daylight and sunlight requirements post-development/ would not be unacceptably overshadowed. PA note that daylight/ sunlight to proposed central communal courtyard was not assessed. **Further Information** sought.
- *Overlooking* – proposal complies with GCDP S. 11.3.1 (d) Overlooking and 2023 Guidelines' SPPR1 (Separation Distances) on basis that inward &

outward looking windows are screened within the building fabric/ positioned to avoid same.

- *Traffic* – additional traffic from proposal will not materially affect operational capacity of the site access junction with R339 (will still operate below capacity). Site's proximity to high quality public transport and proposed cycle lanes (re: Galway Transport Strategy) noted in context of Mobility Management Plan modal split/ reduced car journey objective.
- *Car Parking* – 25 no. car parking spaces to serve 38 no. units can be justified on basis of maximum provision allowable in urban Galway under 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines being 1 no. space per dwelling, public transport service and location of site proximate to city centre, employment and tertiary education hubs. However, proposal to provide 9 no. of said spaces within Radharc na Gréine not acceptable on account of overspill parking issues in that estate. **Further Information** sought.
- *Setback from R339* – setback required along entire roadside boundary to provide for future 2m wide cycle path & 2m wide footpath. Space to be cleared & finished. **Further Information** sought.
- *Accessibility* – requirement to ensure all proposed footpaths and access routes are Part M compliant. **Further Information** sought.
- *Residential Amenity* – neighbour has raised concerns about noise/ disturbance arising from siting of proposed cycle parking area along north-eastern boundary. Potential noise impact arising from roof-top heat pumps not assessed. **Further Information** sought.
- *Drainage* – proposal to connect to public sewer and water mains is acceptable on basis of Uisce Eireann pre-connection inquiry on file. Surface water management proposals also acceptable in principle subject to Storm Water Audit. **Further Information** sought.
- *Part V* – PA satisfied in principle with proposal to provide for units on site.
- *AA Screening* – project not likely to have a significant effect on any European site(s) either individually or in combination with other plans or projects.

- *EIA Screening* – project is sub-threshold for EIA. No EIAR required.

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 01/05/2025 in relation to 11 no. items.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 06/08/2025. The FI response included a cover letter, a confirmation of feasibility from Uisce Eireann, revised architectural drawings, an architectural report, updated TTA, MMP and Sunlight & Daylight assessment, a Noise Impact Assessment, a Stage 1 Storm Water Audit and copies of the readvertised public notices.

The FI redesign reduced the number of proposed units from 38 no. to 36 no. and gave rise to a revised unit mix, with related changes to building design.

The response was determined to be significant and required readvertising (significant further public notices were published & erected on 15th August 2025).

It was noted by the PA that, in the period since the issuing of the FI request, new Section 28 Design Standards for Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities were published (on 8th July 2025).

Planner's Report (03/09/2025) – Further Information Stage

- *FI Item 1 (Unit Mix)* – revised proposal for 16 no. 1-beds (44.5%), 18 no. 2-beds (50%) and 2 no. 3-beds (5.5%) complies with GCDP Policy 3.1 (Housing Strategy).
- *FI Item 2 (Setback)* – proposal to provide 2m setback at roadside frontage to accommodate future cycle lane & 2m wide footpath is acceptable.
- *FI Item 3 (Accessibility)* – access routes' Part M compliance demonstrated.
- *FI Item 4 (Glazing to Habitable Rooms)* – redesign & rationalisation of unit mix has addressed earlier concerns. However, the lightwell/ void feature created on north-east elevation gives rise to new overlooking/ noise issues. **Clarification of FI Recommended.**
- *FI Item 5 (Car Parking)* – proposed management of car parking provision within the scheme and the Radharc na Gréine estate has not been addressed. **Clarification of FI Recommended.**

- *FI Item 6 (Light to Central Courtyard)* – combined assessment of rooftop and courtyard amenity space submitted does not address PA concerns regarding light to/ overshadowing of internal communal amenity space. 9 no. south-western apartment units should be omitted to ensure sunlight can reach the internal courtyard. **Clarification** of FI Recommended.
- *FI Item 7 (Recreational Facility)* – landscaped roof garden and walking loop around courtyard proposed. PA satisfied that amenity is useable.
- *FI Item 8 (Corner Void Feature)* – redesign and the omission of earlier void area is acceptable to the PA.
- *FI Item 9 (Balcony Design/ Materiality)* – proposed balustrade height (1.1m) and materiality (steel and glass) are acceptable to PA.
- *FI Item 10 (Noise)* – findings of Noise Impact Assessment (plant & equipment etc.) that there is unlikely to be an adverse impact on noise sensitive receptors within & neighbouring the development, for both day & nighttime periods, accepted.
- *FI Item 11 (Storm Water)* – findings of audit, that proposal meets SuDS policy requirements & site infiltration characteristics support soakaway, accepted.

A request for Clarification of Further Information (CFI) issued on 10/09/2025 in relation to 3 no. items.

The applicant's response to the CFI request was received on 31/10/2025 and consisted of a cover letter/ CFI response document(s), revised architectural drawings, updated TTA & MMP, Parking Management Strategy, updated Schedule of Accommodation, a Landscape Design Rationale and landscape plans. The response was determined to be significant and required readvertising (significant further public notices were published and erected on the 18th and 20th November 2025).

Planner's Report (11/12/2025) – Clarification of Further Information Stage

- *CFI Item 1 (Residential Disamenity arising from Void Area)* – redesigned floor plans & elevation for 1st & 2nd floors of north-eastern façade acceptable on basis previously obscured/ fixed shut windows replaced by clear opening windows, with internal void area also omitted in favour of balconies etc. – PA

satisfied that CFI daylight/ sunlight, ventilation, fire safety egress and amenity issues addressed. PA also satisfied that redesign will not give rise to overlooking on neighbour's property.

- *CFI Item 2 (Kick About Area & Overshadowing of Central Courtyard)* – concerns raised with design & siting of proposed kick-about recreation space can be addressed by condition. Whilst noting internal courtyard is not required to count toward scheme's communal amenity space (to be provided predominately via landscaped roof garden), PA of view that proposal is not fully compliant with Sections 4.3 (Communal Amenity Space) or 4.1 (Access and Services) of the 2025 Apartment Guidelines on basis that height & orientation/ design of a perimeter apartment block must allow adequate levels of sunlight to reach communal amenity space provided within the courtyard and also due to the requirement that such circulation/ common areas be ventilated and well-lit with some natural light. PA also raise concerns about implication of low level of natural lighting in courtyard for proposed landscaping (re: survival, maintenance etc.). **PA sought to attach condition (No. 2) omitting 9 no. apartments on the south-west side of the building to enlarge/ open up inner courtyard to address the foregoing issues.**
- *CFI Item 3 (Car Parking Provision and Management)* – submitted Parking Management Strategy and updated TTA & MMP states that all proposed car parking spaces will be controlled & managed by appointed management company. Clarifies that 9 no. parking spaces in Radharc na Gréine estate are in ownership of applicant, have not been formally assigned for use by estate residents or visitors, and will be assigned for use by apartment scheme residents once operational. PA satisfied that 25 no. parking spaces for 27 no. units (as per Condition no. 2) will allow parking demand to be satisfied within applicant's lands and not exacerbate existing parking issues in adjoining estate.

Report concluded by recommending permission be granted, subject to amending conditions, as detailed in Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- *Drainage Department (07/04/2025 and 19/08/2025)* – surface water proposals acceptable subject to condition, with details required.
- *Active Travel Department (14/04/2025)* – note Monivea Road is a cycle feeder route on the Galway Transport Strategy and recommends that the development's roadside frontage be setback in order to facilitate the provision of 4m wide footpath and cycle lane. Requirement to also ensure all footpaths and access routes are Part M compliant.
- *Active Travel Department (09/12/2025)* – proposal acceptable subject to suggested conditions.
- *Parks Department (23/05/2025)* – invasive species management plan required on account of presence of butterfly bush knotweed on site; clarification sought on how proposal complies with GCDP Table 11.2 (Recreational Facilities) and Apartment Guidelines Sections 3.25 (Private Amenity Space) & 4.13 (Children's Play Space); further information required on the quality and useability of roof level amenity space and daylight/ sunlight to the internal courtyard and amenity space within neighbouring estate; soft landscaping detail can be dealt with via recommended condition; and, potential conflict between drainage infrastructure and tree planting to be addressed.
- *Parks Department (11/11/2025)* – invasive species management plan & cert. of disposal required by compliance; proposed FI kick about area is not additional but substitution amenity space; applicant is required to demonstrate useability of roof garden as amenity space; clarity needed on amount of sunlight to housing estate play area to south; further consideration regarding shade tolerant planting/ tree species in atrium required; and, potential clash between proposed sewers and tree planting not addressed.
- *Building Control (04/07/2025)* – works to be carried out in line with Building Regulations.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No submissions received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

7 no. third party submissions were received from neighbouring property owners Mary & Patrick Creavin-Ludden, Ciara Walsh, Gerry and Marie Murray, Slawomir Cetnarski. These raised the following issues:

- *Zoning/ Site Specific Objective*
- *Planning History*
- *Layout & Building Line*
- *Height and Overdevelopment*
- *Unit Mix*
- *Concerns Re: Classification and Quality of Communal Open Space*
- *Impact on Existing Residential Amenity re: Overlooking & Overshadowing*
- *Parking and Mobility Management*
- *Active Travel Improvements*
- *Traffic Hazard and Congestion*
- *Noise and Disturbance*
- *Siting of Bike Shelter and Kick About Area*
- *Anti-Social Behaviour in Estate Playground*
- *Operational Management & Maintenance*
- *Pressure on Existing Infrastructure & Facilities*
- *Play Space Recreational Facilities*
- *Structural Impacts on Neighbouring Properties.*
- *Drawing Inaccuracies in respect to overall no. of apartments.*

The aforementioned observations included photographs of current parking arrangements within the Radharc na Gréine estate in addition to extracts taken from application documentation and links to relevant policy and other documents.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

P.A. Ref. 22/221 – application by Green Way Estates (Sligo) Ltd. for the extension of duration of the development permitted under *P.A. Ref. 16/332*, up until 5th November 2025, was granted permission on 07/09/2022.

P.A. Ref. 16/332 (ABP Ref. PL61.248815) – application by Green Way Estates (Sligo) Ltd. for the demolition of disused glasshouses etc. and 2 no. habitable houses and for the construction of 52 no. houses (4 no. 5-bedroom 2.5 storey houses; 22 no. 4-bedroom 2-storey houses; 16 no. 3-bedroom 2.5-storey houses; 5 no. 3-bedroom 2-storey houses, and 5 no. 2-bedroom 2-storey houses); 80 no. parking spaces to serve the residential units; public open space to serve the residential units; a 3-storey commercial building (2786 sqm GFA) incorporating retail, medical and office space and dental practice; 52 no. parking spaces to serve the commercial building; public open space to serve the commercial building; closure of three existing vehicular entrances to the site from Monivea Road and creation of a new main entrance to the site from Monivea Road and one shared entrance for 2 no. houses fronting Monivea Road; an internal circulation network for motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians; connection to the public water, wastewater and drainage network; an ESB substation to serve the development, and associated landscape and site works – all on a site of 2.012 ha, decision to grant permission upheld on appeal on 06/11/2017 subject to 17 no. conditions [residential element of this permission has been constructed and forms the existing Radharc na Gréine housing estate].

Residential Zoned Land Tax

ABP Ref. VZ61.317870 – First party appeal by Greenway Estates Ltd. in respect to the inclusion of lands at Monivea Road/Ballyban Beg, Galway City (including the appeal site) on the Residential Zoned Land Supplementary Map. Board confirmed the determination of the PA, Galway City Council, on the 09/11/2023.

4.2. Neighbouring Sites – Off Monivea Road

Crown Square Mixed-Use Development Site to North-West

ABP-310348-21 – application for 345 no. Build to Rent apartments and 2,538m² of non-residential floorspace across 4 no. blocks of 6-10 storeys and associated site works granted permission on 13/09/2021 subject to 19 no. conditions.

ABP-304928-19 – application for 288 no. apartments and c. 4,096m² of other floorspace including a primary care centre, creche, fitness centre, a restaurant and shops in 3 no. blocks of 5-8 storeys over basement and lower ground levels, granted permission on 30/10/2019 subject to conditions.

P.A. Ref. 20/292 – application for amendments to the permission granted under 18/363 which involved the reduction in the extent of the basement car park and a different vehicular access point from the Monivea Road, granted on 26/02/2021 subject to conditions.

P.A. Ref. 18/363 – application for a 7-year permission 40,405m² of office accommodation in 5 blocks up to 6 storeys high and a hotel of 8,675m² up to 5 storeys high together with a double basement with car parking and other facilities across the site, granted on 01/05/2019 subject to condition.

Infill Site to North-East

P.A. Ref. 19/182 – application by Green Way Estates (Sligo) Ltd. for two no. 3-bedroom 2-storey houses which will share an entrance with two previously approved houses (Pl. ref. 16/332, currently under construction) with the inclusion of 2 no. additional shared parking spaces, together with all associated drainage and site works at Monivea Road, granted planning permission on 18/09/2019 subject to 15 no. conditions.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2025)

- NPO 3c (deliver 30% new housing in existing built-up footprint).
- NPO 6 (regenerate cities, towns and villages).
- NPO45 (increase residential density through infill development, increased height and more compact forms of development).

Climate Action Plan 2025

TR/25/7: Advance roll-out of walking/cycling infrastructure in line with National Cycle Network and CycleConnects plans and TR/25/8: Renew the approach to Shared Mobility, including public bikes schemes in Galway.

National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBPA) 2023-2030

The 4th NBAP strives for a “*whole of government, whole of society*” approach to the governance and conservation of biodiversity. The aim is to ensure that every citizen, community, business, local authority, semi-state and state agency has

an awareness of biodiversity and its importance, and of the implications of its loss, while also understanding how they can act to address the biodiversity emergency as part of a renewed national effort to “act for nature”. This National Biodiversity Action Plan 2023- 2030 builds upon the achievements of the previous Plan.

Planning Design Standards for Apartments – Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2025)

These guidelines were cited by the PA in their assessment [they apply to applications submitted after 9th July 2025 (application submitted on 11/03/2025)].

The Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2024)

- 50% projected population growth to be directed into five cities including Galway.
- Table 3.2 – Area and Density Ranges Limerick, Galway and Waterford City and Suburbs. ‘City - Urban Neighbourhoods’ The city urban neighbourhoods category includes: (i) the compact medium density residential neighbourhoods around the city centre that have evolved over time to include a greater range of land uses, (ii) strategic and sustainable development locations; and (iii) lands around existing or planned high capacity public transport nodes or interchanges (defined in Table 3.8) – all in the city and suburbs area. These are highly accessible urban locations with good access to employment, education and institutional uses and public transport. It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 50 dph to 200 dph (net) shall generally be applied in urban neighbourhoods of Limerick, Galway and Waterford.
- Table 3.8 (Accessibility) – ‘High Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange’ - Lands within 1,000 metres (1km) walking distance of an existing or planned high capacity urban public transport node or interchange, namely an interchange or node that includes DART, high frequency Commuter Rail11, light rail or MetroLink services; or locations within 500 metres walking distance of an existing or planned BusConnects ‘Core Bus Corridor’¹² stop. Highest

densities should be applied at the node or interchange and decrease with distance. the planned public transport. Accessible Location 'Planned public transport' in these Guidelines refers to transport infrastructure and services identified in a Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy for the five cities and where a public authority (e.g. National Transport Authority, Transport Infrastructure Ireland or Irish Rail) has published the preferred route option and stop locations for the planned public transport.

- Section 3.4.2 of the Guidelines states that it is necessary to ensure that the quantum and scale of development at all locations can integrate successfully into the receiving environment. New development should respond to the receiving environment in a positive way and should not result in a significant negative impact on character (including historic character), amenity or the natural environment.
- Section 5.3.1 and SPPR 1 (Separation Distances): *When considering a planning application for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces. There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses, duplex units and apartment units in statutory development plans and planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.*
- SPPR 3 – Car Parking: *It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that:*
 - (i) *In city centres and urban neighbourhoods of the five cities, defined in Chapter 3 (Table 3.1 and Table 3.2) car-parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. The maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development at these locations, where*

such provision is justified to the satisfaction of the planning authority, shall be 1 no. space per dwelling.

Applicants should be required to provide a rationale and justification for the number of car parking spaces proposed and to satisfy the planning authority that the parking levels are necessary and appropriate, particularly when they are close to the maximum provision. The maximum car parking standards do not include bays assigned for use by a car club, designated short stay on-street Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations or accessible parking spaces. The maximum car parking standards do include provision for visitor parking.

- Section 5.3.7 (Daylight) *“In drawing conclusions in relation to daylight performance, planning authorities must weigh up the overall quality of the design and layout of the scheme and the measures proposed to maximise daylight provision, against the location of the site and the general presumption in favour of increased scales of urban residential development. Poor performance may arise due to design constraints associated with the site or location and there is a need to balance that assessment against the desirability of achieving wider planning objectives. Such objectives might include securing comprehensive urban regeneration and or an effective urban design and streetscape solution”.*
- Appendix A: Glossary of Terms - Habitable Room: Primary living spaces such as living rooms, dining rooms, studies and bedrooms.

Guidelines for Planning Authorities - Design Standards for New Apartments (DoHLGH, 2023)

Section 3.0 (Apartment Design Standards) –

- Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR) 1: Housing developments may include up to 50% one-bedroom or studio type units (with no more than 20-25% of the total proposed development as studios) and there shall be no minimum requirement for apartments with three or more bedrooms.
- SPPR 3: Minimum Apartment Floor Areas: 1-bedroom apartment (2 persons) - 45 sq.m; 2-bedroom apartment (4 persons) - 73 sq.m; 3-bedroom apartment (5 persons) - 90 sq.m.

- Sections 3.6 and 3.7 provide that planning authorities may also consider a two-bedroom apartment to accommodate 3 persons, with a minimum floor area of 63 square metres, in accordance with the standards set out in Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – with no more than 10% of the total number of units in any private residential development comprising this category of two-bedroom three person apartment.
- Section 10.8 - requirement that the majority of all apartments in any proposed scheme of 10 or more apartments exceed the minimum floor area standard for any combination of the relevant 1, 2 or 3 bedroom unit types, by a minimum of 10%.
- SPPR4 - A minimum of 33% of dual aspect units will be required in more central and accessible urban locations, where it is necessary to achieve a quality design in response to the subject site characteristics and ensure good street frontage where appropriate in. In suburban or intermediate locations, it is an objective that there shall generally be a minimum of 50% dual aspect apartments in a single scheme.
- SPPR 5 – Ground level apartment floor to ceiling heights shall be a minimum of 2.7m.
- Section 4.1 (Access & Services) – *Within apartment buildings, hallways and shared circulation areas should be appropriate in scale and should not be unduly narrow. They should be well lit, with some natural light, where possible and adequate ventilation.*
- Section 4.11 (Communal Amenity Space) – *Communal amenity space may be provided as a garden within the courtyard of a perimeter block or adjoining a linear apartment block. Designers must ensure that the heights and orientation of adjoining blocks permit adequate levels of sunlight to reach communal amenity space throughout the year. Roof gardens may also be provided but must be accessible to residents, subject to requirements such as safe access by children. These facilities offer a satisfactory alternative where climatic and safety factors are fully considered, but children’s play is not passively supervised as with courtyards.*

- Section 4.13 (Children’s Play) – *The recreational needs of children must be considered as part of communal amenity space within apartment schemes. Experience in Ireland and elsewhere has shown that children will play everywhere. Therefore, as far as possible, their safety needs to be taken into consideration and protected throughout the entire site, particularly in terms of safe access to larger communal play spaces. Children’s play needs around the apartment building should be catered for: • within the private open space associated with individual apartments (see chapter 3); • within small play spaces (about 85 – 100 sq. metres) for the specific needs of toddlers and children up to the age of six, with suitable play equipment, seating for parents/guardians, and within sight of the apartment building, in a scheme that includes 25 or more units with two or more bedrooms; and • within play areas (200–400 sq. metres) for older children and young teenagers, in a scheme that includes 100 or more apartments with two or more bedrooms. The perimeter block with a central communal open space is particularly appropriate for children’s play, especially if access from the street is controlled.*
- Section 4.20 (Car Parking) *The quantum of car parking or the requirement for any such provision for apartment developments will vary, having regard to the types of location in cities and towns that may be suitable for apartment development, broadly based on proximity and accessibility criteria.*
 - 1) Central and/or Accessible Urban Locations** *In larger scale and higher density developments, comprising wholly of apartments in more central locations that are well served by public transport, the default policy is for car parking provision to be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated in certain circumstances. The policies above would be particularly applicable in highly accessible areas such as in or adjoining city cores or at a confluence of public transport systems such rail and bus stations located in close proximity. These locations are most likely to be in cities, especially in or adjacent to (i.e. within 15 minutes walking distance of) city centres or centrally located employment locations. This includes 10 minutes walking distance of DART, commuter rail or Luas*

stops or within 5 minutes walking distance of high frequency (min 10 minute peak hour frequency) bus services.

2) Intermediate Urban Locations *In suburban/urban locations served by public transport or close to town centres or employment areas and particularly for housing schemes with more than 45 dwellings per hectare net (18 per acre), planning authorities must consider a reduced overall car parking standard and apply an appropriate maximum car parking standard.*

- *Section 4.25 - For all types of location, where it is sought to eliminate or reduce car parking provision, it is necessary to ensure, where possible, the provision of an appropriate number of drop off, service, visitor parking spaces and parking for the mobility impaired. Provision is also to be made for alternative mobility solutions including facilities for car sharing club vehicles and cycle parking and secure storage. It is also a requirement to demonstrate specific measures that enable car parking provision to be reduced or avoided.*

Appendix 1 – sets out the minimum requirements for aggregate floor areas, room areas and widths, storage space, private and communal amenity space.

Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (DoHLGH, 2020) [now superseded] – policy guidance as per the 2023 guidelines detailed above in respect to requirements on children’s play areas, car parking, unit mix, refuse storage, apartment floor areas, dual aspect and minimum requirements for aggregate floor areas, room areas and widths, storage space, private and communal amenity space.

Sustainable Residential Developments in Urban Areas-Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2009) [now superseded].

Section 7.9 – communal open space in the form of roof gardens.

Section 4.20 - In large infill sites or brown field sites public open space should generally be provided at a minimum rate of 10% of the total site area.

5.2. Other National/ Technical Guidance

Cycle Design Manual (2023).

Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (BRE, 2022).

Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019).

5.3. Regional Policy

Northern & Western Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2020-2032 – RPO 3.2: (a) Deliver at least 50% of all new city homes targeted in the Galway MASP, within the existing built-up footprint of Galway City and suburbs.

5.4. Development Plan

The Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029 (GCDP) applies.

Zoning/ Site Specific Objective

The site is zoned 'CI – Enterprise, Light Industry and Commercial' with a stated objective 'To provide for enterprise, light industry and commercial uses other than these reserved to the CC zone'.

The appeal site is also subject to the following specific development objective under Section 11.2.6 (Commercial/Industrial CI Land Use Zoning Objective): "*CI zoned lands on Monivea Road (Radharc na Greine site). Residential development on the full extent of this CI zoned site will be considered. The density and height of any proposed development on this site should align with the existing overall Radharc Na Greine Development*".

It is noted that the Monivea Road to the immediate north of the site is unzoned and subject to specific objectives for 'road improvements' and 'bus routes'.

Suburban Development Management

The appeal site comes within the established suburb of Mervue as per Figure 11.32 (Neighbourhood Areas).

Policy 3.5 (Sustainable Neighbourhoods): 'Established Suburbs' states that it is policy of the Council to: 1. *Facilitate consolidation of existing residential development and densification where appropriate while ensuring a balance between the reasonable protection of the residential amenities and the character*

of the established suburbs and the need to provide for sustainable residential development and deliver population targets. 2. Encourage additional community and local services and residential infill development in the established suburbs at appropriate locations.

Section 11.3.2 (Established Suburbs) – *as per the standards for Outer Suburbs except:*

Section 11.3.2 (a) General: In the interests of sustainability and urban design, higher densities may be appropriate when new residential development or commercial/community development has regard to the prevailing pattern, form and density of these areas.

Section 11.3.2 (b) Amenity Standards: Shall be as per Outer Suburbs except in certain circumstances where the established form and layout would deem a reduction in these standards appropriate, in the interests of sustainability, architectural quality and urban design. These will be assessed on performance based criteria.

Section 11.10 Urban Development and Building Height: *With respect to building height, developments shall specifically have regard to the Galway Urban Density and Building Height Study (2021) which sets out the framework for density and building height in the city. Part D Spatial Strategy outlines the potential for appropriate building densities and heights for new development in each geographic zone and sub zone of the city.*

Residential Development

Section 8.8 and Policy 8.7 (Urban Design and Placemaking) of the CDP seek to encourage high quality urban design in all developments.

Policy 3.1 (Housing Strategy) of the CDP supports a diverse range of house types, sizes and types in housing developments.

Section 3.4 Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept – Housing Mix: *Proposed residential developments will need to provide sufficient housing mix to meet the requirements of different households and demographics and in particular to reflect emerging household trends...* Sustainable Housing: *In the design and*

layout of residential development, there are opportunities to minimise energy use and maximise efficiency. New developments should aim to achieve high levels of natural daylight entering buildings to maximise daylight and sunlight including dual aspect design and orientation broadly to the south.

Policy 3.3 (7): Ensure the design of residential developments have regard to the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009) and demonstrate compliance with the Urban Design Manual—A Best Practice Guide and the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019).

Section 11.3 - Residential Development: *Apartment developments will be reviewed having regard to the above and also the Government guidance, Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020), which provides the current quantitative guidance for designing apartments in order to ensure design quality safeguards are in place to avoid the development of poor quality living environments.*

Section 11.3.1(c) Amenity Open Space Provision in Residential Developments – *Private Open Space*: Developments which are exclusively apartment developments shall adhere to the private open space standards set out in the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020).

Communal Open Space: Communal recreation and amenity space is required at a rate of 15% of the gross site area. It should be provided as multi-functional open space in new residential developments easily accessible to all, encouraging active and passive use for persons of all abilities regardless of mobility and/or age. In small restricted infill sites, a minimum of 10% may be provided as public open space where a reduction in the standard is balanced with delivery of units...Communal open space in all types of residential development should: Be overlooked by residential units.

Recreational Facilities - In all proposed residential development over ten units, a recreational facility shall be provided as part of the communal open space and funded by the developer. The recreational facility should be provided to serve the needs of the residents and should reflect the profile of future residents, the scale

and type of development. Indicative examples of recreational facilities for different sizes of developments are shown in Table 11.2.

Table 11.2 - Indicative Examples of Recreational Facilities for Different Sizes of Residential Developments:

No. of Residential Units	Examples of Recreational Facilities
21-50	Small playground, kick about area, landscaped garden/small park

Residential Amenity

Section 11.3.1 (d) Overlooking – *Residential units shall generally not directly overlook private open space or land with development potential from above ground floor level by less than 11 metres minimum. In the case of developments exceeding 2 storeys in height a greater distance than 11 metres may be required, depending on the specific site characteristics.*

Section 11.3.1 (e) Daylight – *All buildings should receive adequate daylight and sunlight. All habitable rooms must be naturally ventilated and lit and living rooms and bedrooms shall not be lit solely by roof lights. Daylight sunlight and/or overshadowing assessment, utilising best practice tools, may be required to assess the impact of development on the amenity of adjoining properties. The requirement for such assessments will be agreed with the planning authority prior to planning application. In this regard, development shall be guided by the quantitative performance approaches and recommendations under the ‘Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight’ (2nd edition): A Guideline to Good Practice (BRE 2011) and BS 8206-2: 2008 – ‘Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for Daylighting’ or any updated guidance.*

Section 11.14.1 Children’s Play areas - *The recreational needs of children must be considered in the design of communal amenity space within apartment schemes and shall accord with Section 4.13 Design Standards for Apartments (2020) of the safety needs shall be considered and safe access to large communal play spaces.*

Parking/ Servicing

Section 11.3 (Residential Development), Car Parking – General: *The approach to car parking for the purpose of assessment of planning applications is applied to developments based on spatial location, public transport services with flexibility to achieve performance based outcomes, in particular for infill and brownfield developments. This approach will be applied to the varying standards between the four defined neighbourhood areas and are centred on the following:*

- *Parking is set at a maximum level of provision.*
- *Flexibility is encouraged where grouped car parking is provided.*
- *Reduced requirement is encouraged in mixed use areas in particular where peak demands do not coincide and where multi-purpose trips are anticipated and in circumstances where mobility management measures are deemed satisfactory.*
- *Consideration of reduction in requirements will also apply along existing and planned strategic public transport corridors depending on the prevailing level of service at that time.*

Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartment 2020 should be applied to any new apartment developments. The standards accept that the quantum of car parking or the requirement for any such provision for apartment developments will vary, having regard to the types of location in cities and towns that may be suitable for apartment development, broadly based on proximity and accessibility criteria.

For all types of location, where it is sought to eliminate or reduce car parking provision, it is necessary to ensure, where possible, the provision of an appropriate number of drop off, service, visitor parking spaces and parking for the mobility impaired. Provision is also to be made for alternative mobility solutions including facilities for car sharing, club vehicles and cycle parking and secure storage. It is also a requirement to demonstrate specific measures that enable car parking provisions to be reduced or avoided. Cycle parking for all areas shall be provided as per the requirements in Section 11.3.1(h).

Section 11.3.2 (c) Car Parking Standards - • *1 on-site per dwelling and 1 grouped visitor per 3 dwellings or, • 1 space per dwelling if grouped.*

A reduction in these standards for ACA's may be considered appropriate where the provision of car parking would adversely affect the architectural character of the area. Generally, these standards should not be exceeded.

Section 4.5 (Transport Demand Management Measures).

Section 11.3.1 (h) Cycle Parking Standards & Table 11.3 Cycle Parking Requirements for Residential Developments – *Min. of 1 no. cycle storage space per bedroom and 1 no. visitor parking space per 2 residential units. Cycle storage facilities to be directly accessible from the public road or from a shared private area that gives direct access to the public road.*

Section 11.23 - Water Quality.

Other

Other generally relevant policies/ objectives include: Section 1.4 (Core Strategy Context), Section 3.2 (Housing Strategy), Section 4.2 (Land Use and Transportation), Section 8.8 (Urban Design and Placemaking) and Section 11.31 (Climate – Scheme Sustainability Statements).

5.5. Documents which Support the Development Plan

Galway City Urban Density and Building Heights Study September 2021 – The purpose of the Galway City Urban Density and Building Heights Study was to examine what are the optimal densities and heights that can achieve the most efficient and effective use of land, can make a positive contribution to the character of the city, can create good quality mixed use communities while also contribute to successful place making and liveability. The study contributed to the formulation of a strategy on density and height to inform the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029.

Section 18.3 North and East – Tirellan, Ballinfoile, Renmore, Murrough, Mervue, Ballybaan of the Galway City Urban Density and Building Heights Study (September 2021).

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjoining a European Site.

The following European sites are located within proximity to the site:

European Site	Site Code	Distance
Inner Galway Bay SPA	004301	c. 1.1km
The Lough Corrib SPA	004042	c. 4.2km
Galway Bay Complex SAC	000268	c. 1.1km
Lough Corrib SAC	000297	c. 2.5km

The following proposed Natural Heritage Area is also located in proximity to site:

- Galway Bay Complex pNHA (Site Code 000268).
- Lough Corrib pNHA (Site Code 000297).
- Moycullen Bogs NHA (Site Code 002364).
- Cregganna Marsh NHA (Site Code 000253).

7.0 EIA Screening

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

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have concluded, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development 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 (refer to form in Appendix 3 for details).

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal submission was received on 23/01/2026 relating specifically to Conditions No's 2 and 3 of the PA decision to grant permission for the development.

Condition No. 2 states: *“Prior to commencement of development revised drawings shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority showing the omission in full of nine (9 no.) proposed apartment units along the south-western section of the apartment building, the units to be omitted include ground floor apartment units no. 2, no. 3, no. 4, first floor apartment units no.14, no.15, no. 16 and second floor units no. 27, no. 28 and no. 29 and the remaining land shall be dedicated and landscaped as part of the internal open air courtyard garden for the benefit of apartment residents. The development shall be completed in accordance with agreed details. Reason: In the interest of residential amenities and the proper planning and sustainable development”*.

Condition No. 3 states: *“Prior to commencement of development revised drawings shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority enlarging the size of proposed internal courtyard kitchen windows of apartments while ensuring no direct overlooking between opposing kitchen windows in accordance with Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR) 1 – Separation Distances of the Housing of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024 DHLGH). Reason: In the interest of residential amenities and the proper planning and sustainable development”*.

The grounds of appeal (GOA) can be summarised as follows:

Objection to Condition No. 2

- Results in omission of 9 no. apartment units leaving a total of 27 no.
- 36 no. unit FI/CFI proposal is fully compliant with relevant policies including the Core Strategy which seeks compact urban development in the city and with the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines' objective to support the more intensive use of previously developed land and infill sites.
- PA's reasoning for Condition No. 2 (which gives rise to the omission of 9 no. units) is based on communal amenity space, ventilation and landscaping,

and car parking considerations which are not justified for the following reasons:

Communal Amenity Space

- Proposal to provide c. 465sq.m of communal amenity space via a landscaped roof garden was acceptable to PA at CFI stage (who were also satisfied as to its useability).
- Design of roof garden is compliant with standards for communal amenity spaces set out under Section 4.3 of 2025 Apartment Guidelines and its size exceeds c. 202sq.m requirement under Appendix 1 and 15% of site area required the GCDP.
- Roof garden will provide for active recreation via a walking loop with designated seating, gathering and viewing areas. It is Part M compliant and safe for children to use.
- Recreational needs of children will also be met separately, at grade, via provision of a kick-about space on the south-east side of the apartment block adjacent to the existing estate playground in Radharc Na Greine.
- Proposed atrium space at centre of apartment block, will allow access to apartments and will function as an open-air internal raingarden, featuring dense plantation and SuDS measures, and has been designed to function as a visual rather than recreational residential amenity.
- A comprehensive landscaping and maintenance plan in respect to the atrium was provided at CFI stage.

Ventilation and Landscaping

- Atrium raingarden provides for adequate natural ventilation on account of it being roofless/ open air.
- 2025 Apartment Guidelines do not require natural light to be provided to circulation spaces/ atriums and proposed atrium will be well lit via a combination of natural and artificial light.
- PA Recreation and Amenity Dept. raised a specific concern regarding how the amount of daylighting to the atrium would impact on planting within same

but crucially did not oppose the principle of the proposal for/ provision of an atrium raingarden.

- Sufficiency of natural lighting in atrium for selection/ survival of proposed planting has been addressed at CFI stage via submission of comprehensive landscaping and maintenance plan which outlines proposal to use shade tolerant plant species.
- More detailed proposals with regard to planting within the atrium raingarden could be agreed by compliance (as per PA condition no. 12).

Car Parking

- PA's use of car parking provision as a part of the justification for the omission of 9 no. apartments is not consistent with their determination that reduced car provision is acceptable and compliant with national-local policy on the basis of the site's location, proximity to public transport infrastructure, car sharing/ overprovision of bike parking and the proposed Parking Management Strategy (PMS) etc.

Objection to Condition No. 3

- Design and sizing of kitchen windows as proposed is adequate to provide for required visual amenity, cross ventilation, privacy etc. and is compliant with SPPR1 of 2024 Guidelines.
- Kitchen windows are not relied upon in achieving internal daylight/ sunlight standards.
- No further design intervention/ enlargement of kitchen windows is required and there is no design scope to increase kitchen window sizing further.

The grounds of appeal are accompanied by a copy of the PA's decision notification.

9.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

9.3. Observations

1 no. observation was received from neighbouring property owner, Marie Murray, on 06/02/2026. This raised the following issues:

- *Procedural* – observer was not given opportunity to take a third party appeal against the PA's decision on basis that they were not notified by PA of same.
- *Design/ Height/ Siting of Apartment Block* – will give rise to overlooking, will overshadow house, garden and solar panels, and will obstruct existing sightlines from property.
- *Glazing to Side Elevation* – obscured glazing to windows facing observer's property has been omitted in favour of clear glazing. Privacy impacts arise.
- *Cycle Parking and Kick About Areas* – noise and disturbance concerns raised regarding siting & proximity of these facilities adjacent to observer's property boundary. Seek omission of kick-about area.
- *Communal Rooftop Area* – potential for overlooking and disturbance from noise and anti-social behaviour.
- *Radharc Na Greine Playground* – proposal will increase patronage & existing antisocial behaviour in same putting observer's property at greater risk.
- *Parking* – inadequate provision will give rise to overspill parking in public realm on Monivea Road and in adjoining Radharc Na Greine estate and to related pedestrian and traffic hazards.
- *Noise* – increased traffic will give rise to an increase in noise pollution.
- *Property damage* – to foundation of observer's house arising from proposal.

The observation is accompanied by a copy of the following: a letter from the PA (dated 03/02/2026) stating that an administrative error had meant that no letter issued to the observer to notify them of the decision to grant permission and a letter from the PA (dated 27/03/2025) confirming their submission on the application had been received.

10.0 Assessment

This is a first party appeal against 2 no. conditions of a grant of permission. Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) allows the

Commission (so long as it is satisfied that the application does not require an assessment as if it had been made to it in the first instance) to give the relevant planning authority direction regarding the attachment, amendment or removal of the condition.

I draw the Commission's attention to the existence of a memorandum on the file (dated 26th February 2026) which designates this case as being of 'High Priority' and outlines the background to the case, whereby the observer was not notified of the PA's decision to grant during the appropriate appeal period and therefore did not have the opportunity to take a third party appeal against same.

In light of the procedural issue raised and the priority status of the case, I am not satisfied that the appeal can be dealt with under Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and this report represents my de novo assessment of the proposal.

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, having inspected the site and, having regard to the relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
 - Zoning
 - Height and Density
 - Siting and Layout
- Omission of Apartments (Condition No. 2)
 - Public and Communal Open Space
 - Lighting and Ventilation to Common/ Access Areas
 - Parking
- Standard of Accommodation
 - Aspect
 - Glazing to Kitchens (Condition No. 3)
 - Unit Mix/ Occupancy – New Issue
 - Standard of Accommodation

- Parking
- Impact on Existing Residential Amenity
- Other

10.1. Principle Of Development

Zoning

- 10.1.1. The appeal site is subject to zoning objective 'CI – Enterprise, Light Industry and Commercial'. The purpose of this zoning is 'To provide for enterprise, light industry and commercial uses other than these reserved to the CC [City Centre] zone'. 'Residential' is identified as a use which may contribute to the CI zoning objective (dependent on location and scale of development) where it is *“of a scale that would not unduly interfere with the primary use of the land for CI purposes and would accord with the principles of sustainable neighbourhoods outlined in Chapter 3”*.
- 10.1.2. In respect to the CI zoning objective of the site, I note that permission was granted by the Board on 6th November 2017 under ABP Ref. PL61.248815 for retention demolition and the construction of a mixed-use development (52 no. houses and a 3-storey c. 2786sq.m commercial building) on lands which included the appeal site, with this permission subsequently being extended up until 5th November 2025 under P.A. Ref. 22/221. The residential element of this permission is now complete and forms the Radharc Na Greine housing development, with the commercial element (which was to be developed on the appeal site) never constructed.
- 10.1.3. Notwithstanding the foregoing, I note that the following site specific development objective also applies to the lands subject of this appeal: *“CI zoned lands on Monivea Road (Radharc na Greine site). Residential development on the full extent of this CI zoned site will be considered. The density and height of any proposed development on this site should align with the existing overall Radharc Na Greine Development”*. Therefore, having regard to the specific objective which applies to the lands, I consider the proposal for a fully residential scheme on the lands to be acceptable in principle under the terms of the development plan subject to the detailed considerations below.

Height and Density

- 10.1.4. The Radharc Na Greine estate comprises of 2-storey houses, with steeply pitched roofs featuring dormer attic level accommodation, which extend to a height of c. 10.2m. The mixed-use commercial building permitted by the Board under PL61.248815 extended to c. 11.3m in height and this was considered acceptable relative to the height of the proposed housing. The proposed apartment building extends to c. 11.37m in shoulder height, and I am satisfied that this is generally in-keeping with the height and scale of development previously permitted on the site.
- 10.1.5. The 36 no. unit proposal before the Commission provides a gross density of c. 116uph. Whilst no definitive information is available in respect to the density of the housing estate, based on the 2.012ha site area applied for under PL61.248815 minus the area of the appeal site (c. 0.311ha), it would appear to be in the order of c. 33uph (gross).
- 10.1.6. Policy 3.3(5) of the GCDP encourages higher residential densities at appropriate locations as guided by the Galway Urban Density and Building Height Study (2021) including mixed use zoned sites located close to public transport routes and routes identified in the Galway Transport Strategy as suitable for high frequency, public transport services. This study identifies the eastern established suburbs of Galway City, such as Mervue, as having a prevailing low density of between 25-30uph and states that heights between 2-3 storeys would be generally open for consideration within these suburbs with scope for densities of between 30 – 50uph. However, the study also specifically recognises the ongoing mixed-use redevelopment of the Crown site (across the road and with a scale of up to 8-storeys in height) and the transformation this has made to the built character of the area.
- 10.1.7. In setting out the policy on residential density, Section 3.4 (Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept) of the GCDP states that *“To support population increases and reflect national policy on compact growth and in order to render efficiencies from infrastructural investment, higher residential densities are required at appropriate locations, especially in conjunction with public transport facilities and active travel networks”*. It also seeks to have regard to the

Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, 2009 (under Policy 3.3(7)) which have subsequently been replaced by the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines. These guidelines reflect Government policy which seeks to increase residential density through infill development, increased height and more compact forms of development.

- 10.1.8. The PA refer to Table 3.2 (Area and Density Ranges Limerick, Galway and Waterford City and Suburbs) of the 2024 Guidelines in their reasoning for accepting the proposed density and make it clear that they classify the site as coming within the 'City-Urban Neighbourhoods' category which allows for densities in the range of 50 – 200uph to be generally applied.
- 10.1.9. It is apparent to me that the acceptability of the proposed density depends on the relative accessibility classification of the site under Table 3.8 of the guidelines. I note that the Monivea Road adjoining the site is subject to specific objectives for 'road improvements' and 'bus routes' and features existing bus stops within 200m-300m walking distance of the appeal site. It is stated in the GOA that the site is located along a high frequency public transport corridor which will be replaced by 'Route 1' of the Bus Connects programme which will operate as a high frequency route. Having consulted the Bus Connects Galway Network Map published by the NTA in December 2023, it is clear the Monivea Road will form part of the proposed 'Route No. 1' connecting the Gateway Shopping area to the Parkmore Business Park via the city centre, with a route frequency of 10-12 minutes on weekdays at midday and every 15 minutes generally. On the basis that the definition of a 'High Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange' provided for under Table 3.8 includes lands located within 500m walking distance of an existing or planned BusConnects 'Core Bus Corridor' stop which has a 10-15 minute peak hour frequency, I am satisfied that the appeal site falls under the definition of same.
- 10.1.10. In light of the foregoing considerations, I am satisfied that the proposed height and density is acceptable having regard to the site specific planning history, the built context of the site and its proximity to existing and planned public transport infrastructure and facilities within the area, specifically the Bus Connects 'Core Bus Corridor' on Monivea Road which will provide enhanced walking, cycling and bus infrastructure in the immediate site vicinity.

Siting and Layout

10.1.11. I note that the scale and massing of the proposed apartment building, in terms of its height and width, is generally in keeping with that of the commercial building permitted by the Board under PL61.248815. However, the observer has raised a concern regarding its siting as it relates to the Monivea Road to the north on the basis that it is not in-keeping with the established building line (extending c. 5-6m forward of same).

10.1.12. Having inspected the site and its surrounds, I note that whilst there is a generally consistent building line on the south side of the Monivea road (with the exception of the Cregal art supply complex to the east) there is also significant existing variation in the building lines on the opposite side of the road, with the buildings in the former Eircom/ Eir complex being sited at offset angles to the road. Given this wider built context, together with the existing boundary treatments and levels of planting on the south side of the road in addition to those proposed for the north side of the apartment scheme (ornamental planting interspersed with street trees etc.), I do not consider that the disparity between the existing and proposed building line(s) would be evident to the degree that it would give rise to visual disharmony.

10.2. **Omission of Apartments (Condition No. 2)**

10.2.1. The PA's refusal reason No. 2 requires 9 no. apartment units (no's 2-4 at ground floor and no's 14-16 and no's 27-29 at first and second floor levels) in the south-western section of the apartment building to be omitted in favour of the opening up/ extension of the internal atrium in order to benefit future residential amenity.

10.2.2. The GOA provide a detailed rebuttal as to why condition no. 2 is not justified, with the arguments focusing on the policy compliant nature of the communal amenity space provided, the inconsistency in the PA's treatment of the scheme's car parking provision and, the PA's misapplication of technical landscaping advice and ventilation guidance.

10.2.3. In terms of the points raised with regard to the nature and extent of landscaping in the central atrium raingarden (and the implication of low levels of natural lighting with regard to same), I deal with the matter of shade tolerant planting separately under Section 10.6 of this report.

Public and Communal Open Space

- 10.2.4. Neither the GCDP nor the 2020/ 2023 Apartment Guidelines outline specific quantitative requirements in respect to the provision of public open space on the lands. Notwithstanding, the Sustainable Residential Development Guidelines (2009) are referred to in GCDP Section 11.3 (Residential Development) and in Policy 3.3 (Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept) where it states that the PA will have regard to the 2009 Guidelines, with Policy 3.1 (Housing Strategy) requiring that all new housing developments to be carried out in accordance with these guidelines (except where the apartment guidelines apply). The 2009 guidelines require 10% of the total site area to be given over to use as public open space in the case of large infill sites or brownfield sites. Having considered the totality of the CI zoned lands at Radharc Na Greine, where existing public open space (comprising of two separate areas under PL61.248815: a greenspace to the south-west and sports & play facilities to the north-east in accordance with condition no. 13 attached to that permission) has already been provided at a rate of 15% (of gross site area), I am satisfied that the cumulative development on the lands complies with this requirement.
- 10.2.5. The proposal for 36 no. units gives rise to a communal open space requirement of c. 206sq.m in accordance with the quantitative standards set out under Appendix 1 of the 2023 (and 2020) Apartment Guidelines. The appellant proposes to provide for c. 605sq.m of communal amenity space at roof level in the form of a landscaped garden, with this provision amounting to c. 19.5% of the gross site area of c. 3110sq.m excluding the additional amenity facilities (perimeter seating and kick about area etc.) provided at grade. This provision is compliant with GCDP Section 11.3.1 (c) 'Amenity Open Space Provision in Residential Developments', which requires that 15% of the gross site area be given over to use as communal open space.
- 10.2.6. In qualitative terms, the GCDP requires that communal amenity space be accessible to all and overlooked by residential units and provide for both active and passive use, with Section 4.11 (Communal Amenity Space) of both the 2020 and the 2023 Apartment Standards stating that "*Roof gardens may also be provided but must be accessible to residents, subject to requirements such as safe access by children. These facilities offer a satisfactory alternative where*

climatic and safety factors are fully considered, but children's play is not passively supervised as with courtyards". Similarly, the Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines (2009) state that, in terms of communal open space, "Roof gardens may offer a satisfactory alternative to courtyard communal open space, provided that climatic and safety factors are fully considered".

- 10.2.7. The submitted information on the proposed rooftop garden shows that it has been designed to accommodate Part M compliant access and to be safe for use by children. The landscape plan illustrates the detailed design of the garden which will feature a walking loop and various picnicking and seating areas interspersed with ornamental and sedum-type planting and trees. In terms of its likely microclimate and levels user comfort and safety, I note from the submitted sections and elevations that the amenity space will be framed by photovoltaic/ solar panels and edge planters etc. which will line the perimeter and provide for climatic and physical enclosure.
- 10.2.8. I note that the BRE guideline requirement for amenity overshadowing requires at least 50% of an amenity area to receive two hours on sunlight on March 21st. The submitted daylight and sunlight assessment provides an analysis of sunlight to the roof level amenity space and shows that c. 89% of the proposed communal open space will receive the required level of sunlight in compliance with GCDP Section 11.3.1 (e) Daylight.
- 10.2.9. Having considered the proposed design and enclosure arrangements to the proposed rooftop garden, I am satisfied that it is likely to provide a communal amenity space which is sufficiently useable and of good quality. Furthermore, whilst it will not be passively surveilled by residential units, I consider that controls in respect to its management and operation as detailed in Section 10.5 of this report would address any potential for misuse of, or anti-social behaviour within, same.
- 10.2.10. Having regard to the proposed height and orientation of the apartment block, the PA raised an issue in respect to the non-assessment of daylight/ sunlight to the atrium raingarden at application and FI stages. This was notwithstanding their acknowledgement that this space is not required to count toward scheme's

communal amenity space. The proposed open air atrium raingarden, which is located at the centre of the perimeter apartment block and externally accessible from 3 no. accesses points, is c. 150sq.m in area and will function as a landscaped circulation space which gives access to own-door ground floor apartments. The Architectural Design Statement and Typology Precedent report submitted at CFI stage outlines how it will also provide for rainwater attenuation, cross ventilation, emergency access/ egress and visual amenity etc. and provides examples of such spaces being used in the design of other Irish and continental schemes. It is my view that, as it is not designed for use as a functional communal amenity space nor is it relied on for the achievement of internal daylighting to the proposed apartments, there is no policy requirement to demonstrate the compliance of this space with daylighting or sunlighting standards. Notwithstanding, it is clear from the submitted documentation that atrium raingarden will provide for a high quality semi-private space that will complement the amenity of the roof garden (which acts as the scheme's communal amenity space) and also the functionality of the at-grade communal open space which is proposed to be used as seating and kick-about areas etc.

10.2.11. The PA formed the view that proposal is not fully compliant with Sections 4.3 (Communal Amenity Space) and 4.1 (Access and Services) of the 2025 Apartment Guidelines (notwithstanding the fact that the 2023 apartment guidance applies to this proposal on account of its lodgement date of 11/03/2025 which predated the adoption of the 2025 guidelines), with the 2020 apartment guidelines also being relevant on account of, inter alia, the requirement under Section 11.3 of the GCDP which states that "*Apartment developments will be reviewed having regard to the above and also the Government guidance, Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020)*". I have dealt with the former matter in the preceding paragraphs where I conclude that the PA's concerns regarding the quality of the proposed communal open space are not justified and do not therefore form a reasonable basis on which to omit apartments. I consider the latter matter further below.

Lighting and Ventilation to Common/ Access Areas

- 10.2.12. Part of the PA's rationale for attaching amending condition no. 2 to their grant of permission was the requirement that circulation/ common areas be ventilated and well-lit with some natural light.
- 10.2.13. Section 4.1 (Access & Services) of the 2023 Apartment Guidelines and Section 4.2 of the 2020 Apartment Guidelines provide that "*Within apartment buildings, hallways and shared circulation areas should be appropriate in scale and should not be unduly narrow. They should be well lit, with some natural light, where possible and adequate ventilation*". Whilst subject of a separate statutory code, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed open air perimeter apartment block design would give rise to inadequate ventilation. In respect to lighting, I note that the policy requirement refers specifically to the lighting of common/ circulation areas by natural means only where possible and does not restrict lighting by artificial means. In this regard, I note the clarification provided in the GOA that the proposed atrium will be well lit via a combination of natural and artificial light and I draw the Commission's attention to the Outdoor Lighting Plan and report, with details of horizontal illuminance (lux), submitted. In light of the foregoing, I do not consider access and ventilation to be a reasonable basis on which to justify the omission of apartments within this scheme.

Parking

- 10.2.14. The appellant raises an issue with the PA's use of car parking provision as a part of their justification for the omission of 9 no. apartments and argues that it is not consistent with their determination that reduced car provision (i.e. 25 no. spaces to serve 36 no. apartments) is acceptable and compliant with national-local policy (on the basis of the site's location and proximity to public transport infrastructure etc).
- 10.2.15. In note that the PA, in their assessment of the response to CFI Item No. 3, outline their satisfaction with the provision of 25 no. parking spaces to serve 27 no. units (as per Condition no. 2). This is on the basis that it will allow parking demand to be satisfied within applicant's lands and will not exacerbate existing parking issues in the adjoining estate.
- 10.2.16. Having reviewed the information on file, I agree with the appellant's view that the PA's rationale for condition no. 3, as it relates to the scheme's car parking

provision, is not consistent with their conclusions expressed elsewhere in their reports and I draw the Commission's attention to Section 3.2.1 of this report in this regard. I deal with the general matter of parking in Section 10.4 of this report.

10.3. **Standard of Accommodation (Condition No. 3)**

Aspect

- 10.3.1. The GCDP requires that new developments aim to achieve a high level of dual aspect design (Section 3.4 (Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept) refers). In this regard, 36 no. predominantly dual aspect apartments are proposed. The 3-storey apartment block follows a perimeter block type arrangement with the central atrium raingarden providing for interior deck access at each level, with many of the apartments relying on this interior space for their secondary aspect. On account of the design, siting and orientation of the proposal, I note that none of the apartments face exclusively due north. In light of the foregoing, I am satisfied that the aspect of the apartments complies with the requirements of both the 2020 and 2023 apartment guidelines which require a minimum of 33% of units to be dual aspect in more central and accessible locations as per their SPPR4.

Standard of Accommodation

- 10.3.2. The 36 no. apartments proposed comprise of 16 no. 1-beds (c. 47.4sq.m – 62 sqm), 18 no. triple occupancy 2-beds (c. 65sq.m – 82sq.m) and 2 no. 5-person 3-beds (c. 130sq.m) – each with a dedicated (recessed) private balcony ranging in size between (c. 5-13sq.m). The PA were satisfied with the standard of accommodation provided for by the proposed apartments in terms of their mix, aspect, sizing, layout and private amenity space – notwithstanding, I note that their acceptance appears to be based, in part, on an assessment of the proposal against the 2025 apartment guidelines rather than the 2023 apartment guidelines or indeed the 2020 apartment guidelines. In considering the issue of internal daylighting, the PA were also satisfied with the submitted Daylight & Sunlight Analysis which found that all apartments would meet the required internal daylight/ lighting requirements.
- 10.3.3. Having considered the submitted proposals against the relevant quantitative standards on minimum overall and aggregate floor areas; minimum bedroom

floor areas and widths; minimum aggregate bedroom floor areas; and minimum storage, private amenity and communal amenity space as set out under the GCDP and Appendix 1 (Required Minimum Floor Areas and Standards) of the 2023 Apartment Guidelines together with Appendix 1 of the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020), I am also satisfied that they are fully compliant with same and will provide for a good standard of future residential amenity.

Unit Mix/ Occupancy – New Issue

- 10.3.4. However, I do note that the proposed unit mix, which provides for 18 no. triple occupancy 2-bed apartments, is not compliant with the policy guidance set out under Sections 3.7 of the 2020 and 2023 apartment guidelines which, whilst noting that variation in dwelling size is needed, state that no more than 10% of the total number of units in any private residential development may comprise this category of two-bedroom three-person apartment.
- 10.3.5. Section 11.3 (Residential Development) of the GCDP states that “*Apartment developments will be reviewed* having regard to the....*Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020), which provides the current quantitative guidance for designing apartments in order to ensure design quality safeguards are in place to avoid the development of poor quality living environments*”. However, on the basis that this policy guidance does not state that proposals *shall comply* with the 2020 apartment guidelines or require that proposals be determined *in accordance with* same, I do not consider the unit mix/occupancy issue gives rise to a material contravention of the development plan. I also note that the 10% proportional restriction on triple occupancy 2-beds is not a Specific Planning Policy Requirement under either the 2020 or 2023 apartment guidelines, with the current 2025 apartment guidelines providing for a two-bedroom three-person apartment typology that is not subject to any preclusion or indeed percentage or numerical restriction.
- 10.3.6. In considering the acceptability of the proportion of triple occupancy 2-bed units (50%) within the proposed unit mix, it is important to consider the unit mix in the wider Radharc Na Greine residential estate, in addition to the policy guidance with respect to housing mix set out under the GCDP. 52 no. houses were

permitted under PL 61.248815, with just 5 no. of these comprising of 2-bed units with the remainder being 3-bed, 4-bed and 5-bed houses. In regard to the latter, I note that Section 3.4 (Sustainable Neighbourhood Concept – Housing Mix) requires that proposed residential developments provide sufficient housing mix to meet the requirements of different households and demographics and in particular to reflect emerging household trends, with Policy 3.1 (Housing Strategy) requiring that multi-unit proposals provide a range of unit sizes and types in order to satisfy, inter alia, the demographic trend of reduction in average household sizes (as detailed in the plan’s Housing Demand Needs Assessment).

Glazing to Kitchens (Condition No. 3)

- 10.3.7. I note that, in their report of 23/04/2025, the PA determined that the proposal complies with GCDP Section 11.3.1 (d) Overlooking and the 2024 Guidelines’ SPPR1 (Separation Distances) on basis that inward and outward looking windows are screened within the building fabric/ positioned to avoid same. The submitted floor plans illustrate that a separation of c. 10.5m is provided between the opposing internal elevations of the apartments facing directly into the atrium.
- 10.3.8. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the PA’s condition No. 3, which is subject of this appeal, requires the appellant to enlarge the size of the proposed internal courtyard kitchen windows of the apartments, whilst ensuring no direct overlooking between opposing kitchen windows, in the interest of residential amenity. Having reviewed the 3 no. PA reports in detail together with the reports of the technical departments, I can find no clear basis for the attachment of condition no. 3.
- 10.3.9. The appellant argues that the design and sizing of the kitchen windows as proposed is adequate to provide for the required standard of visual amenity and cross ventilation whilst also safeguarding residential privacy by complying with SPPR1 (Separation Distances) of the 2024 Guidelines.
- 10.3.10. SPPR1 of the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines requires a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms (i.e. primary living spaces whose definition does not include kitchens) above ground floor level. Having consulted the proposed first and second floor plans, I note that the u-shaped design of the kitchen areas in the apartments on

the south side of the block (i.e. units no's 16-19 and no's 29-32) reads as being physically separate to the adjoining living room/ dining space and that it is windows to these kitchens that face into the atrium – with the larger, main windows serving the living room/ dining space being located on the opposite side of the building facing out from the scheme. Therefore, in light of the foregoing considerations, I am satisfied that the proposal provides for an adequate standard of future residential privacy which is not in conflict with SPPR1 or Section 11.3.1 (d) of the development plan.

10.3.11. The proposed kitchen windows facing into the atrium vary in width between c. 0.95m – 1.2m with the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted at FI stage illustrating how each of the apartment units within the proposal meet the applicable sunlight (EN 17037:2018 habitable room sunlight exposure recommendation of greater than 1.5 hours on March 21st) and daylight (BS EN 17037:2018 target illuminance values of 100 lux for bedrooms, and 200 lux for combined Kitchen/Living/Dining areas) standards. On the basis of these results, there would appear to be no sunlight/ daylight related requirement to increase kitchen window size.

10.3.12. In light of the foregoing considerations, I see no clear reason in design or lighting terms that would justify the requirement for the windows to be increased in size and I consider that their current design appropriately balances the safeguarding of residential privacy with visual amenity and cross ventilation requirements. On this basis, I consider such an amending condition to be unwarranted in this instance.

10.4. **Parking**

10.4.1. The provision and management of car parking was addressed to the satisfaction of the PA at CFI stage following the submission of updated an TTA and MMP which outlined how all proposed car parking spaces will be controlled and managed by appointed management company via a site specific parking management strategy. Notwithstanding, the appellant considers that the PA used car parking provision as part of the basis for justifying the omission of 9 no. apartments by condition. I deal with this matter in Section 10.2 of this report.

- 10.4.2. Parking was raised as an issue at all stages prior to appeal and I note that it is the observer's view that inadequate provision has been made for car parking and that this will give rise to overspill parking in the public realm on Monivea Road and in the adjoining Radharc Na Greine estate.
- 10.4.3. The MMP outlines how 25 no. parking spaces located at grade are proposed to serve the 36 no. apartment units with these including 9 no. spaces located within the Radharc Na Greine estate (to the immediate east of the house at No. 4) which are under the control of the appellant.
- 10.4.4. Having visited the site and its surrounds, I note that each of the residential properties fronting Monivea Road to the east and west of the appeal site have in-curtilage parking. The houses in the Radharc Na Greine estate are, in turn, served by 67 no. car parking spaces (as permitted) which are laid out in home zone arrangements. The plans permitted under PL61.248815 identify the location of 56 no. car parking spaces associated with the commercial element of the development – with these being located mainly within the body of the appeal site, but also including 9 no. spaces to the east of No. 4 Radharc Na Greine in addition to 6 no. spaces located to the immediate west of the ESB substation to the rear of the site (which I note are excluded from the application red line with the site layout plan including an annotation stating that this car parking is designated to the existing housing).
- 10.4.5. GCDP Section 11.3.2 (c) Car Parking Standards outlines a requirement for 1 on-site per dwelling and 1 grouped visitor per 3 dwellings or 1 space per dwelling if grouped. Whilst the level of car parking provided does fall short of same, I note that Sections 11.3 (Residential Development) 'Car Parking – General' and 4.5 (Transport Demand Management Measures) provide that parking is set at a maximum level of provision, that a consideration of reduction in requirements will apply along existing and planned strategic public transport corridors depending on the prevailing level of service at that time and that, where it is sought to eliminate or reduce car parking provision, provision be made for appropriate alternative mobility solutions, drop off, service, visitor parking spaces and parking for the mobility impaired. In relation to any new apartment development, Section 11.3 (Residential Development) of the GCDP requires that the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (DoHLGH, 2020) should

be applied. These guidelines accept that the quantum of car parking or the requirement for any such provision for apartment developments will vary, having regard to the types of location in cities and towns that may be suitable for apartment development, broadly based on proximity and accessibility criteria.

- 10.4.6. SPPR 3 (Car Parking) of the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines provides the contemporary national policy context for assessing whether a reduced level of car parking is warranted and/ or appropriate in this instance. In this regard, as detailed in Section 10.1 of this report, in policy terms the appeal site is considered to be located in a highly accessible location and therefore can be considered under subsection (i) of SPPR3. This states that car parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated in such areas with applicants required to provide a rationale and justification for the number of car parking spaces proposed and to satisfy the planning authority that the parking levels are appropriate.
- 10.4.7. The appellant's MMP sets out a detailed rationale for the proposed reduced rate car parking based on the site's relative location, baseline area census and modal share data and existing and future accessibility by modes of active travel and public transport, and provides a justification for same on the basis of a number of proposed measures including parking management, the appointment of a travel plan coordinator, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure enhancements and carpooling/ car sharing initiatives. I note that a separate Parking Management Strategy Report is also submitted which provides details of the practical, day-to-day application of this strategy via an on-site parking permit system etc. and enforcement of same. Overall, having regard to the unit mix proposed, and specifically the percentage of 1-bed units proposed (i.e. 16 no. or 44%), I consider the information submitted constitutes a reasonable basis to justify the car parking ratio proposed at this location in this specific instance.
- 10.4.8. In light of the foregoing considerations, I am satisfied that the proposal provides for car parking levels which comply with applicable policy requirements set out in the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines and that the accessibility of the site and its proximity to the city centre, to a neighbourhood centre and to extensive employment lands should reduce the need for the use of private cars.

- 10.4.9. As highlighted earlier in this report, concerns have been raised about the permanent loss of 9 no. spaces in the Radharc Na Greine estate. The TTA submitted provides the results of a parking survey of these specific spaces which found that the maximum number occupied at any one time was around two thirds for a max. duration of c. 45 minutes. In this respect, whilst I acknowledge that the proposal will give rise to some displacement of casual/ ad-hoc parking, it is clear that these spaces are not formally assigned or sanctioned for use by the residents of or visitors to the estate and were originally intended to serve the subject site – with their use up to this point being a temporary/ meanwhile arrangement which does have the benefit of formal consent.
- 10.4.10. In respect to the concerns raised about uncontrolled and/ or unauthorised parking on the road network in vicinity of site and in the Radharc Na Greine estate, I would note that the PA were satisfied with the ratio of parking proposed and that the control of parking on public roads is a matter for the local authority. The planning report submitted with the application states that this estate (which is no longer in the ownership of the appellant) has been taken in charge by the local authority and, on this basis, parking control and management within same would also fall within the remit of local authority.

10.5. **Impact on Existing Residential Amenity**

Overlooking and Overbearance

- 10.5.1. The observer has raised concerns that the design of the apartment block will give rise to overlooking of their property and has raised a specific issue with the glazing on the east side elevation particularly having regard to the CFI stage replacement of previously obscured/ fixed shut windows on the north-eastern facade with clear opening windows.
- 10.5.2. SPPR 1 (Separation Distances) of the 2024 Compact Settlement Guidelines states that applications for residential development require a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the side of houses, and apartment units, above ground floor level be maintained, with Appendix A of the guidelines defining same as “*primary living spaces such as living rooms, dining rooms, studies and bedrooms*”. GCDP Section 11.3.1 (d) requires that, in the case of developments exceeding 2 storeys in height, a

distance greater than 11 metres may be required, depending on the specific site characteristics. I note from the site layout plan that the east side elevation of the apartment block is setback c. 13.5m from the side gable of the observer's property at its closest point (with a greater separation provided further to the south), which features one small window at first floor level which appeared from my site inspection to serve an ensuite bathroom and not a habitable room. Given the separation provided for, and the fact that the eastern façade of the apartment block does not directly oppose any habitable rooms, I am satisfied that no adverse overlooking of the adjoining residential dwelling will occur.

10.5.3. I acknowledge that any development on this site – in this case a 3-storey apartment development with a shoulder height of c. 11.37m – will result in a significant change in built context that will affect the observer's property. Notwithstanding, given the appropriate separation provided for, I am satisfied that the development as proposed will not appear visually overbearing on adjoining dwellings.

10.5.4. I also note that it is proposed to use the roof level of the apartment building as communal amenity space in the form of a c. 605sq.m landscaped garden. The landscape plan and sections submitted at CFI stage illustrate the design of same and I note that c. 2m wide photovoltaic panels will line the outer edge with green walls and edge planters providing an intermediate visual buffer or screening between the roof garden and neighbouring properties. This arrangement, when combined with the minimum c. 13.5m separation distance between the side gable of the 3-storey apartment block and the side gable of the observer's 2-storey property (with this separation increasing further to the south), would provide for an offset of over 15m between the two properties preventing overlooking and would also mitigate the perception of overbearance. In light of same, I consider that no additional screening or planting would be required.

Overshadowing

10.5.5. The observer considers that height and siting of the proposed 3-storey apartment block to the west will negatively impact on their daylighting and sunlighting of their property which is 2-storeys in height and located due east. I note that this issue was already addressed at FI stage with Sections 5.0 - 7.0 of the Daylight

and Sunlight Assessment submitted illustrating that the proposal has no potential to significantly affect the internal sunlighting or daylighting of neighbouring properties adjoining the site or to give rise to overshadowing of their private amenity spaces to an extent that would render over 50% of their garden unable to receive 2 hours of sunlight on March 21st. Having regard to my site inspection and to the information on file, I am satisfied that this is likely to be the case.

Noise Disturbance

- 10.5.6. I note that the issue of noise arising from proposed roof level plant was addressed to the satisfaction of the PA at FI stage following the submission of a Noise Impact Assessment which found that this plant is unlikely to give rise to an adverse impact on noise sensitive receptors within or neighbouring the development for both day and nighttime periods. I also draw the Commission's attention to the siting of this plant on the north side of the roof away from adjacent residences. However, the observer has raised concerns regarding the potential for unacceptable noise to arise from additional traffic, the proposed cycle parking arrangements and the kick-about area on the east side of the apartment block and also from the rooftop communal amenity space.
- 10.5.7. I deal with the potential for traffic noise and noise arising from the proposed kick-about area separately in Section 10.6 of this report in the context of wider issues raised in respect to these matters.
- 10.5.8. The appellant is proposing to provide 60 no. covered bike parking spaces (which is compliant with GCDP Section 11.3.1 (h) Cycle Parking Standards & Table 11.3 which requirement of 46 no.) using Sheffield type stands (or similar) in a secure landscaped area on the eastern side of the site which is readily accessible from the public road and located adjacent to the side gable of the observer's property (which is blank with the exception of a small window at first floor level). Having regard to the existing built context of the site, which comprises of a regional road and an existing children's playground and basketball court (to the immediate rear of the house) within a newly built housing estate, I do not consider it likely that the use of the facility for the parking of bikes would give rise to unacceptable noise or disturbance to neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding, I note from my site inspection that the proposed covered bike stands may be visible over the

existing c. 1.6m high blockwork boundary wall between the properties giving rise to some visual disamenity. On this basis, I consider it appropriate that the appellant be required to provide for additional screening/ planting and/or an increase in the height of the eastern property boundary adjoining the observer's property so as to mitigate this issue. This matter can be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

10.5.9. I have dealt with the matter of potential overlooking from the roof level amenity space in paragraph 10.5.4 above and whilst I consider the c. 15m separation distance that will be provided to be appropriate in that regard, given the suburban context of this site, I note that the nighttime use of this facility - if not subject to control by the scheme management company - could have the potential to give rise to noise and related disturbance to both scheme residents and neighbouring properties. There is no information on file with regard to the future operation or management of this rooftop space and, for this reason, I recommend to the Commission that a condition for agreement be attached to control the use of and hours of access to the roof level amenity space. This could require a noise/ activity management policy to be put in place to prohibit use of the roof level amenity space after 9pm for example.

10.6. **Other**

Landscaping

10.6.1. Whilst the PA were generally satisfied with the nature and extent of the appellant's landscaping proposals, a specific issue was raised by the Parks Dept. at FI stage in respect to the requirement for shade tolerant planting/ tree species in the atrium raingarden (on account of its potential to be overshadowed).

10.6.2. It is argued in the GOA that the selection of planting for the atrium was addressed at CFI stage via the submission of a comprehensive landscaping and maintenance plan which outlines the appellant's proposal to use various shade tolerant plant species in this location.

10.6.3. I note that the information on file with regard to the scheme landscaping includes a comprehensive landscape design rationale report and landscape maintenance plans submitted at CFI stage which provide details of shade tolerant plant and tree species in addition to a proposed planting schedule for the 'atrium shade

garden'. On this basis, it is my view that the appellant's proposals satisfy the requirement for shade tolerant planting/ tree species in the atrium rain garden and I consider that the specific details of this planting strategy (selection and likely survival of tree species etc.) could reasonably be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Invasive Species

10.6.4. I draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the submitted ecology report noted the existence of invasive plant species (*Buddleja davidii* etc.) on the site, with the PA's Recreational and Amenity Dept. recommending that an Invasive Species Management Plan and cert. of disposal be requested by compliance. I observed these invasive species along the perimeter of the site during my inspection and I consider that the requirement to prepare management plan specifying appropriate biosecurity measures to control further spread etc. would be a reasonable and proportionate response that could be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Recreational/ Play Facilities

10.6.5. Following the submission of the RFI, which proposed a children's kick-about space (c. 90sq.m) at grade on the south-east of the site in proximity to the existing playground, the PA were satisfied that, in principle, the appellant had provided a designated facility in compliance with the requirement under GCDP Sections 11.3 (Residential Development: Recreational Facilities) and 11.14.1 (Children's Play Areas). Having reviewed the proposal against the relevant provisions of the plan, I also note that it reflects the intent of Table 11.2 (Indicative Examples of Recreational Facilities for Different Sizes of Residential Developments) which cites a 'kick about area' as an example of a recreational facility which would be suitable for a residential scheme of between 21-50 no. units.

10.6.6. Notwithstanding the foregoing, I do note that the observer has raised a concern regarding likely noise and disturbance to their property arising from the siting of the kick about area adjoining their property and that they are seeking its omission on this basis.

- 10.6.7. The Recreational and Amenity Dept. in their report of 11/11/2025 noted that the proposed kick-about area was not additional amenity space but instead a substitution for an earlier seating area/ rain garden. In considering this comment together with the concerns raised by the observer, the case planner decided to seek the omission of the kick-about space (as per Condition No. 12(c)).
- 10.6.8. From a functional and urban design perspective, I consider the siting of the proposed kick about space, which will enjoy a favourable southerly aspect and be passively overlooked by the apartments, to be appropriate having regard to its placement adjacent to the existing estate playground to the south and the scheme's pedestrian connection to same.
- 10.6.9. The kick about area is proposed to function as an informal playspace for the scheme's resident children with the hours of use likely to reflect the nature of this intended use. Having considered the plans and inspected the observer's property, which is also proximate to the existing playground to the south, I note that there is an existing garden shed structure located along the c. 1.6m high shared boundary wall which is likely to break the line of sight from the rear of the dwelling whilst also providing for a physical buffer to the kick about area. Given this as-built context together with its likely hours of use by children, I do not consider that the kick about space is likely to give rise to unreasonable levels of noise or disturbance. Notwithstanding, the risk to the observer's property arising from, for example, the kicking of footballs etc. against or over the boundary wall at this location has not been addressed in the submitted documentation via proposals for ball stop netting or similar. Therefore, as discussed in paragraph 10.5.8 of this report, I consider it appropriate that the appellant be required to provide for additional screening/ planting and/or an increase in the height of the eastern property adjoining the observer's property, in order to protect same, by condition.
- 10.6.10. Therefore, on balance, I consider the siting of the kick about area to be appropriate to its immediate context and in placemaking terms and in light of the mitigation set out under paragraph 10.5.8 and 10.6.9, I do not consider that its omission would be warranted in this instance. Notwithstanding, were the Commission to take a contrary view on this matter it would be open to them to apply a condition requiring the future management company to enforce set hours

of use etc. or to omit the kick about area in favour of another recreational amenity facility to be agreed by compliance as per Condition No. 12(c) attached to the PA's decision.

Procedural Issues

10.6.11. The observer states that they were not notified of the PA's decision to grant during the appropriate period and therefore did not have the opportunity to take a third party appeal. Whilst I acknowledge that this was the case on the basis of the correspondence from the PA provided as part of the observation, I note that the PA's decision notification procedures are outside the scope of this appeal or the remit of the Commission and that any issue in respect to same is a matter for resolution between the PA and the observer.

10.6.12. Concerns in respect to the accuracy of submitted drawings are raised by third parties. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns raised, having inspected the site and reviewed the information on file, I am satisfied that I have sufficient information before me to continue to assess the development subject of this appeal. It also does not appear that any party was prejudiced by any potential drawing discrepancies.

Anti-Social Behaviour

10.6.13. The observer seeks to draw the Commission's attention to ongoing anti-social behaviour in the children's playground in the Raharc Na Greine housing estate (adjoining their property), which they are concerned could be exacerbated by the proposal. I note that this issue was also raised by other third party submissions at planning application stage.

10.6.14. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns regarding ongoing anti-social behaviour that have been raised, I note that they relate to a civil/ criminal matter and to property which is publicly accessible and not in the ownership or control of the appellant. Notwithstanding, I note that the current undeveloped status of the appeal site gives rise to local disamenity and to a blank frontage adjoining the existing playground to the south-east. In this regard, the proposal for a 3-storey apartment building with south-facing balconies, pedestrian pathways and connections into the Radharc Na Greine estate will provide for greater passive surveillance and

street-level animation and activity at this location which is likely to disincentivise anti-social behaviour.

Property Damage

10.6.15. The observer has raised a concern with regard to the potential of the proposal to give rise to structural damage to the foundation of their house. As noted earlier in this report, a separation distance of c. 13.5m is provided between the side gable of the 3-storey apartment block and the side gable of the observer's 2-storey property (with this separation increasing further to the south). Notwithstanding, I note that matters relating to property damage and legal liability etc. are civil matters and are therefore not a relevant consideration for the Commission in the context of this appeal.

Traffic

10.6.16. The issue of traffic congestion was raised by third parties, with the observer concerned that any increase would give rise to greater levels of noise and disturbance in the locality.

10.6.17. I note that the TTAs submitted at application and FI stages determined that additional trip generation/ vehicular movements generated by the proposal (by 2042 with development in place the junction could be operating at 8% capacity in the AM peak hour and 7% during the PM peak hour) would not have the potential to materially affect the operational capacity of the T-junction with the R339 (which would continue to operate well below capacity (85%) for uncontrolled junctions). Having inspected the site and its existing access arrangements and having observed the traffic volume and conditions in the vicinity, I accept that this is likely to be the case and, as such, I am satisfied that the proposal will not give rise to traffic congestion on the local road network and that existing traffic together with the traffic generated by proposal can be readily accommodated within the existing local road network without requiring any mitigations or upgrades to same. I also note that the PA's Transportation Division was satisfied with same and did not raise the issue of cumulative road capacity issues.

10.6.18. In respect to the issues raised regarding the potential for the proposal to give rise to traffic hazard, I note that the TTA found that no road safety issues arose

on the basis that no change to the road network is proposed (i.e. as development is being accessed of an existing T-junction with the R339) where adequate sightlines will continue to be achieved, with pedestrians and vulnerable road users also continuing to be catered for.

10.6.19. The noise measurements (taken on weekdays and over the weekend) which informed the Noise Impact Assessment undertaken at FI stage determined that the site's baseline noise climate was dominated by particular sources which included road traffic noise from Monivea Road (R339) and distant construction noise from the Crown Square development (across the road). Given that the proposal will not give rise to a material change to local traffic environment, I am satisfied that its associated vehicular movements will also not give rise to a material change in the baseline noise environment.

Sightlines

10.6.20. The observer has raised a concern that the design and siting of the proposal, together with its landscaping, will obstruct western sightlines from their property.

10.6.21. Having inspected the observer's property, I note that it features a splayed vehicular entrance delineated by stone piers and wing walls which adjoins the public footpath on Monivea Road. There is also a large, mature tree within the property on the east side of the entrance that is likely to obstruct driver visibility and sightlines on that side when exiting the property.

10.6.22. I note from the submitted plans that the northern (front) building line of the proposed apartment block will be setback c. 14m from the carriageway of the R339 with no potential for this building to obstruct sightlines from the neighbouring property. The landscape masterplan submitted at CFI stage denotes the existence of the observer's vehicular entrance to the north-east and proposes a pedestrian pathway and plaza in the corner of the site adjoining same. Having considered the detail of the landscaping proposals at this location (i.e. clipped hedging to a max. height of 1.2m along the shared boundary, seating, a mixed ornamental raised planter fronting the public footpath) together with the proposal to set the site boundary further back in order to provide for a wider public footpath, I consider that there is no potential for the proposal to obstruct the existing western sightline from the observer's property.

Wastewater and Water Supply

- 10.6.23. The GOA contend that the proposal is capable of being serviced via public networks.
- 10.6.24. The servicing of the scheme by the public water mains and foul drainage network was addressed at application stage, with the PA determining the proposals to be acceptable on the basis of the Uisce Eireann (UE) pre-connection inquiry on file.
- 10.6.25. I note the reference to a pre-connection inquiry being submitted to UE in October 2024 in the Proposed Surface Water & Foul Water Drainage Report and the subsequent submission of a copy of a Confirmation of Feasibility (CoF) dated 25th March 2025 as part of the RFI response. The CoF confirms that the proposed water and wastewater connections are feasible without upgrade. In light of the foregoing, I consider that there is sufficient evidence before me to demonstrate the availability of adequate water supply and wastewater system capacity. On that basis, it is my view that the matter of the feasibility of connecting to the UE network is capable of being addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.
- 10.6.26. The CoF also draws attention to existence of a water main and foul sewer running through this site and advises the appellant that they have the option of providing a setback/ buffer from same or entering into a diversion agreement with UE. I note that the existence of this existing infrastructure on site was addressed by the scheme engineers in their aforementioned report which states that “*There is an existing 300mm diameter surface water sewer along the eastern side of the site which is proposed to be diverted to accommodate the new proposed building footprint*” and that “*As there is an existing 225mm dia. foul sewer running through the site, it is proposed to divert this sewer adhering to Uisce Éireann’s separation distances to accommodate the proposed new development*”. Neither UE nor the PA raised an issue with the diversion proposal and, on this basis, I consider that this matter is capable of being addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Surface Water

- 10.6.27. It is proposed to manage and dispose of surface water on-site via a soakaway and related SuDS measures (raingarden, green/blue roof etc.) with an overflow connection to the existing public storm sewer on Monivea Road.
- 10.6.28. In respect to the overflow connection, the PA were satisfied with this element of the proposal, and I note that there is nothing on file to suggest that the public storm water network does not have adequate capacity to receive same.
- 10.6.29. A review of the proposed surface water drainage design and SuDS proposals was undertaken to the satisfaction of the PA at FI stage following the submission of a Stage 1 Storm Water Audit. This confirmed that the on-site disposal strategy was suitable having regard to the site's infiltration characteristics and that the proposed storm water drainage design is adequately sized and meets the requirements of SuDS to limit surface water runoff and water quality treatment. The report concludes by recommending that there are a number of items relating to design of storm sewer connection, flow control devices and SuDS maintenance & inspection, that require attention/ further clarification at the construction stage. I consider that these are detailed design measures that are capable of being addressed by a condition requiring the implementation of the recommendations of the submitted Stage 1 Storm Water Audit.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend a GRANT of permission subject to the following conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of this brownfield site on lands zoned 'CI – Enterprise, Light Industry and Commercial' with a site specific objective that residential development on the full extent of this CI zoned site will be considered, to the planning policies, objectives and development standards of the Galway City Development Plan 2023 – 2029, to the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (2009), the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2020), the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments (2023) and to the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for

Planning Authorities (2024), the location adjacent to a designated neighbourhood centre, employment lands and to a planned BusConnects ‘Core Bus Corridor’, to the pattern of development in the area, to the planning history related to the lands and to available infrastructural capacity, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would constitute an acceptable form of development at this location, would provide for an acceptable standard of future residential amenity and would not seriously injure the amenities of adjoining properties. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>Development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further information received by the planning authority on the 6th August 2025, and as amended by the clarification of further information submitted on 31st October 2025, 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.</p>
3.	<p>Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.</p>
4.	<p>(a) Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement(s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.</p> <p>(b) Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall enter into a diversion agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) in order to divert</p>

	<p>existing pipes on site in order to accommodate the development hereby permitted.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health, to ensure the provision of adequate water/wastewater facilities and the protection of Uisce Éireann assets.</p>
5.	<p>A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials for each apartment unit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the agreed waste facilities shall be maintained and waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.</p>
6.	<p>The applicant shall implement the measures provided in Section 6.0 of the Storm Water Audit (August 2025) undertaken for the development and received by the planning authority on 6th August 2025.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable drainage.</p>
7.	<p>The applicant shall implement the measures provided in Sections 3.0, 7.0 & 8.0 of the Mobility Management Plan (October 2025) prepared in respect of the development and received by the planning authority on 31st October 2025.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.</p>
8.	<p>The applicant shall implement the measures provided in Sections 2.0, 3.0 & 6.0 of the Parking Management Strategy (October 2025) prepared in respect of the development and received by the planning authority on 31st October 2025.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable transportation.</p>
9.	<p>The applicant shall implement the measures provided in Section 6.0 of the Noise Impact Assessment (August 2025) prepared in respect of the development and received by the planning authority on 6th August 2025.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.</p>
10.	<p>Prior to the commencement of construction, a suitably qualified Ecologist who is appropriately qualified and experienced in undertaking invasive alien species (IAS) surveys and in line with best practice at the appropriate time of year shall carry out a survey of the site for invasive alien species (IAS) designated under the Third Schedule of the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations (2011). A verification report shall be submitted to the planning authority prior to commencement of construction. Should any IAS be found, an IAS Management Plan is also to be provided to the planning authority. Implementation of any IAS Management Plan shall be monitored and signed off by the project ecologist in agreement with the planning authority. No works are to take place until actions of an IAS Management Plan are completed. Depending on the IAS in question, post-</p>

	<p>construction monitoring may be required to ensure controls have been successfully carried out. Any records of IAS found on the site are to be submitted to the planning authority and the National Biodiversity Data Centre (NBDC) using the NBDC standard reporting form to inform future planning and ensure monitoring.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent the spread of alien invasive species.</p>
11.	<p>The management and maintenance of the proposed development, following completion, shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, which shall be established by the developer. A management scheme, providing adequate measures for the future maintenance of the development; including the external fabric of the buildings, internal and external common areas (including the use of and the hours of use of the rooftop communal amenity space), open spaces, landscaping, roads, paths, parking areas, public lighting, waste storage facilities and sanitary services, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, before any of the residential units are made available for occupation.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for the future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity and orderly development.</p>
12.	<p>The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:</p> <p>(a) A plan to scale of not less than [1:500] showing –</p> <p>(i) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs to be planted including specific details of shade tolerant planting proposed for the atrium rain garden.</p> <p>(ii) Details of screen planting and/or roadside/street planting.</p> <p>(iii) Hard landscaping works, specifying surfacing materials, furniture, play equipment, and finished levels.</p> <p>(iv) Details of screening/ screen planting to and/ or changes in the height of the site's eastern property boundary.</p> <p>(b) A timescale for implementation, including details of phasing.</p> <p>The landscaping plan should address any potential clash between proposed sewers and tree planting. All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of three years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p>

	<p>Reason: In the interest of clarity, visual amenity and the protection of the residential amenities of the adjoining property.</p>
13.	<p>(a) 60 no. safe and secure bicycle parking spaces shall be provided within the site in a dedicated cycle storage facility of permanent construction. Provision should be made for a mix of bicycle types including cargo bicycles. Details of the design, layout and marking demarcation of these spaces in the cycle storage facility shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>(b) Details of the operation and maintenance of the cycle storage facilities shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that adequate bicycle parking provision is available to serve the proposed development, in the interest of sustainable transportation.</p>
14.	<p>No additional development shall take place above roof parapet level, including lift motor enclosures, air handling equipment, storage tanks, ducts or other external plant, telecommunication aerials, antennas, or equipment, unless authorised by a further grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity and the visual amenities of the area.</p>
15.	<p>Proposals for the development name and apartment numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Thereafter, all signs and apartment numbers shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.</p>
16.	<p>All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.</p>
17.	<p>Public lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Such lighting shall be provided prior to the making available for occupation of any residential unit.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.</p>

18.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 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.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.</p>
19.	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to construction phase controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils, groundwaters, and surface waters, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, and project roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection.</p>
20.	<p>The site development and construction works shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the adjoining streets are clear of debris, soil and other material and cleaning works shall be carried out on the adjoining public roads by the developer at the developer's expense on a daily basis.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
21.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness; these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of proper planning and sustainable development.</p>
22.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority [in relation to the transfer of a percentage of the land, to be agreed with the planning authority, in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3)(a), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and/or the provision of housing on lands in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3) (b), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended], unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an</p>

	<p>agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.</p>
23.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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

Emma Gosnell
 Planning Inspector
 1st May 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500690-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission to construct a 3-storey apartment building comprising of 38 no. residential units and all associated works.
Development Address	Lands known as Glasshouse Commercial Site, Radharc na Gréine, Monivea Road Galway.
	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 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. No Screening required.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure – dwelling units – 500 units. Proposal is for refurbishment of building to provide 38 no. dwelling units. Part 2, Class 10(b)(iv) - Urban development – 10 hectares (built-up area). Site is c. 0.311ha.

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)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500690-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Permission to construct a 3-storey apartment building comprising of 38 no. residential units and all associated works.
Development Address	Lands known as Glasshouse Commercial Site, Radharc na Gréine, Monivea Road, Galway.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural	The development is for the redevelopment of a brownfield suburban site for residential purposes. It comes forward as a standalone project, does not involve the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk

<p>resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The development site constitutes a cleared, brownfield lands which are currently in use for the storage of construction related machinery and materials, in addition to an area of land in the adjoining estate to the west which is in use as car parking. It is generally enclosed by the existing Radharc na Gréine housing estate and fronts the Monivea Road in the Mervue area in the north-eastern suburbs of Galway City.</p> <p>The Terryland River is located c. 500m to the northwest of the appeal site. This river outfalls to the River Corrib adjacent to the Terryland Forest Park Quincentennial Bridge c. 2.9km to the south-west of the appeal site and from there into the Corrib Estuary which in turn transitions into the Inner Galway Bay North and to the Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004301) and the Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268). However, it is considered that there is no realistic pathway from the appeal site to this river on account of the intervening distance involved and lack of hydrological connectivity – see Appendix 2 for further details.</p> <p>The development is generally removed from cultural heritage features, sensitive natural habitats and designated sites identified significance in the City Development Plan. The proposal’s impact on local traffic and parking conditions and on neighbouring properties are dealt with as part of the Planning Assessment in the main body of the Inspector’s Report.</p> <p>Having regard to the above and the nature and limited scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that impacts on environmental sensitivities can be adequately assessed in this case without the need for EIA.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Due to the nature and scale of the development, the construction stage will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity.</p> <p>The main operational impacts would be limited to residential amenity, traffic, parking and the wastewater and surface water emissions arising from the site. These elements would be subject to standard assessment/design and I am satisfied that they can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA.</p> <p>There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects.</p>

	Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/ features; likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects; and, absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required).

Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Case file: PL-500690-GY-26	
Brief description of project	<p>Normal planning appeal. Proposal to construct a 3-storey apartment building comprising of 38 no. residential units and all associated works on lands known as the Glasshouse Commercial Site, Radharc na Gréine, Monivea Road, Galway – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.</p>
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>The appeal site, which is located in the Mervue area in the north-eastern suburbs of Galway City, comprises of brownfield lands which are currently in use for the storage of construction related machinery and materials and for car parking. It is enclosed by the existing Radharc na Gréine housing estate and fronts the Monivea Road (R339) to the north.</p> <p>Some site clearance and enabling works are required in order to facilitate the proposal.</p> <p>The development involves the construction of an apartment building and all ancillary works etc. Proposed water supply is via a new connection to the existing public mains at Monivea Road/ within Radharc Na Greine estate. The appellant proposes to dispose of their surface water run-off via a soakaway with an overflow connection to the existing public storm sewer on Monivea Road. Foul drainage will be dealt with via a new connection to the existing public sewer at Monivea Road – full details in Section 10 of Inspector’s Report.</p> <p>I draw the Commission’s attention to the noted existence of invasive plant species on the site and to the recommendation of the PA’s Parks Dept. that an invasive species management plan and cert. of disposal required by condition.</p> <p>There are no watercourses or other ecological features of note on the appeal site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area. The Terryland River is located c. 500m to the north-west of the appeal site, this flows south-west before outfalling into the Corrib River to the south-west and from there into the Corrib Estuary to the south. It is considered that, given the intervening distance between the site and this watercourse (and its related waterbodies), it provides no potential hydrological connection to any European sites.</p> <p>The appeal site is underlain in the main by the Clare-Corrib groundwater body which also underlays small sections of the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) and the Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268) which overlap with the edges of these European sites. Whilst there are substantial separation distances involved, which would give rise to significant intervening dilution effects, it is considered that groundwater does provide a potential weak, indirect hydrological connection to these SACs.</p>

	<p>The proposed development site does not provide suitable foraging or roosting habitat for SCI species for which Lough Corrib SPA or Inner Galway Bay SPA have been designated.</p> <p>I note that a miniscule portion of the appeal site (on its south-west corner) is underlain by the Clarinbridge groundwater body (EPA Code IE_WE_G_0008) and also overlaps with the CARROWMONEASH [Oranmore] SC_010 hydrological sub-catchment, however, no SuDS measures that could give rise to a direct groundwater connection or an indirect connection to other European sites (such as Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004031)) which are also underlain by this sub-catchment are proposed to be located in this area of the site.</p> <p>There is considered to be no pathway to any other Natura 2000 sites in the vicinity of the appeal site due to the nature and relatively small scale of the development, the location of the appeal site relative to other European sites and the substantial separation distances involved which would give rise to significant intervening dilution effects.</p>
Screening report	Yes
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant Submissions	<p>The PA referred to the application to the relevant prescribed Bodies. No responses were received as detailed in Section 3.3 of this report.</p> <p>I draw the Commission's attention to the AA screening report prepared by Delichon Ecology submitted as part of the application which identified Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268) and Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004031) as being within the potential zone of influence of the project (on basis of their location in same hydrological sub catchment as the project (i.e. Carrowmoneash (Oranmore)_SC_010) but concluded that there are no ecological or environmental vectors linking the proposed development site with European Sites within the project zone of influence, with no potential for likely significant effects.</p>

Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

Having regard to the source-pathway receptor-model, I consider that there are 2 no. European sites which have the potential to be affected by the proposal. I have excluded all other European sites on the basis of their substantial physical separation from the appeal site and due to the absence of realistic pathways connecting the appeal site to same.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological Connections²	Consider further in screening³
Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297)	Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae) [3110] Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of	c. 2.5km	Yes Potential weak, indirect hydrological connection via groundwater	Yes

	<p>the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or Isoeto-Nanojuncetea [3130] Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of Chara spp. [3140] Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation [3260] Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210] Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae) [6410] Active raised bogs [7110] Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120] Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150] Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae [7210] Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220] Alkaline fens [7230] Limestone pavements [8240] Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0] Bog woodland [91D0] Margaritifera margaritifera (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029] Austropotamobius pallipes (White-clawed Crayfish) [1092] Petromyzon marinus (Sea Lamprey) [1095] Lampetra planeri (Brook Lamprey) [1096] Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106]</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Rhinolophus hipposideros (Lesser Horseshoe Bat) [1303] Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] Najas flexilis (Slender Naiad) [1833] Hamatocaulis vernicosus (Slender Green Feather-moss) [6216] Source: NPWS website accessed 21/04/2026.</p>			
<p>Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268)</p>	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Coastal lagoons [1150] Large shallow inlets and bays [1160] Reefs [1170] Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220] Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310] Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410] Turloughs [3180] Juniperus communis formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands [5130] Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210] Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae [7210] Alkaline fens [7230] Limestone pavements [8240] Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365] Source: NPWS website accessed 21/04/2026.</p>	c. 1.1km	<p>Yes Potential weak, indirect hydrological connection via groundwater</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

AA Screening matrix

Having regard to the comparable impacts and effects arising, I deal with the aforementioned SPA and SAC together below.

Site Name	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<p>Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297)</p> <p>Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268)</p>	<p>Direct: none</p> <p>Indirect: potential weak, indirect hydrological connections via surface water discharge to groundwater.</p>	<p>The contained nature of the site (relatively defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SACs make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SACs for the QIs listed in the table above at either construction or operation stage.</p> <p>In terms of emissions to water, the nearest watercourse is the Terryland River is located c. 500m away at its nearest point. With such an intervening distance, it is considered that there is no physical or functional connection between the appeal site and this watercourse and therefore no potential for this watercourse to act as a hydrological pathway to any European sites. The site is also underlain by the Clare-Corrib groundwater body which also underlays, in small part, the 2 no. aforementioned European sites which are located c. 1.1km-2.5km from the appeal site. Notwithstanding the proposed surface water management and disposal arrangements, with such intervening distances, any silts or other potential pollutants entering groundwater via unattenuated run-off at construction stage or via the proposed surface water system during the operational stage, even in the most extreme scenarios, would be completely attenuated by the dilution, dispersal and settlement that would occur within the groundwater system. There is therefore no prospect that materials carried in surface water drainage from the proposed development site, could have any significant effect on the QIs of the aforementioned European sites.</p> <p>Conservation Objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	

Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on a European Site. No measures specifically intended to avoid or reduce harmful impacts of the proposed development on European sites were taken into account in reaching this conclusion.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites, namely the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) and Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268) in view of these sites' Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature and relatively minor scale of the development.
- Distance from and weak indirect connections/ ecological pathways to the European sites.

Appendix 3

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500690-GC-26	Townland, address	Glasshouse Commercial Site, Radharc na Gréine, Monivea Road, Galway
Description of project		The proposal comprises of the construction of a 3-storey apartment building comprising of 38 no. residential units and all associated works – see Section 2.0 of Inspector’s Report for further details.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>The site is located in the Mervue area in the north-eastern suburbs of Galway city. The c. 0.311ha site comprises brownfield lands which are currently in use for the storage of construction related machinery and materials in addition to an area used for car parking.</p> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <hr style="border: 1px solid black;"/> <p>There are no existing watercourses on the site. The nearest watercourse is Terryland River (EPA Code: IE_WE_30T010500) which is located c. 500m to the northwest of the appeal site. This river has a Moderate Ecological Status but is also At Risk. The Terryland River outfalls to the River Corrib (EPA Code: IE_WE_30C020600, which has a Good ecological status under the WFD and is Not At Risk) adjacent to the Terryland Forest Park Quincentennial Bridge c. 2.9km to the south-west of the appeal site and from there into the Corrib Estuary (EPA Code: IE_WE_170_0700, which has a Good Ecological Status but is Under Review) which in turn transitions into the Inner Galway Bay North (EPA Code: IE_WE_170_0000, which has a Good Ecological Status and is</p>	

	Not At Risk) and to the Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004301) and the Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268). The appeal site is underlain (in the main) by the Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_WE_G_0020) which has a Good Ecological Status under the WFD and is Not At Risk.
Proposed surface water details	Surface water disposal is to a soakaway with an over flow connection to the existing public storm sewer on Monivea Road. See Section 10.6 of this report for further details.
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	The proposed water supply is via a new connection to the existing public mains at Monivea Road/ within Radharc Na Greine estate – see Section 10.6 of this report for further details.
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	It is proposed that foul water drainage be dealt with via a new connection to the existing public sewer at Monivea Road – see Section 10.6 of this report for further details. I draw the Commission’s attention to the fact that there is an existing 225mm dia. foul sewer running through the site. It is proposed to divert this sewer adhering to Uisce Éireann’s separation distances to accommodate the proposed new development.
Others?	The site is located in Flood Zone C and is not at flood risk.

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 run-off, drainage, groundwater)

Terryland River (surface)	c. 500m	Terryland River (EPA Code: IE_WE_30T01 0500)	Moderate	At Risk	Urban Wastewater, Agriculture, etc.	No direct pathway
Corrib River (surface)	c. 2.9km	River Corrib (EPA Code: IE_WE_30C02 0600)	Good	Not At Risk	n/a	No direct pathway
Corrib Estuary (transitional)	c. 1.2km	Corrib Estuary (EPA Code: IE_WE_170_0 700)	Good	Under Review	As above	No direct pathway
Clare-Corrib (groundwater body)	Below site	Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_WE_G_002 0)	Good	Not At Risk	As above	Via surface water run-off to groundwater.

Step 4: 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	Water body 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.	Surface	Terryland River (EPA Code: IE_WE_30T010 500)	No	No	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.	Surface	River Corrib (EPA Code: IE_WE_30C020 600)	No	No	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.	Transitional	Corrib Estuary (EPA Code: IE_WE_170_07 00)	No	No	n/a	n/a	n/a
4.	Ground	Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_WE_G_0020)	Surface water run-off to groundwater.	Water quality degradation.	CEMP.	No. Having regard to the limited scale of the works and the application of measures for the management of surface water, I am satisfied that there would be no significant risk.	No.
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1.	Surface	Terryland River (EPA Code: IE_WE_30T010 500)	No	No	n/a	n/a	n/a

	Surface	River Corrib (EPA Code: IE_WE_30C020 600)	No	No	n/a	n/a	n/a
3.	Transitional	Corrib Estuary (EPA Code: IE_WE_170_07 00)	No	No	n/a	n/a	n/a
4.	Ground	Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code: IE_WE_G_0020)	Surface water run-off to groundwater.	Water quality degradation.	SuDS soakaway.	No. As outlined in Section 10.6 of this report, I do not consider there would be a residual risk in terms of the quantity and quality of discharges from site, which could be linked to this waterbody.	Screened Out.
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A