



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500762-RN-26

Development

Demolish existing house and construction of 20 residential units, road services and all ancillary site development works.

Location

Golf Links Road, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.

Planning Authority

Roscommon County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560101.

Applicant(s)

Reimas Developments Limited.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions.

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal.

Appellant(s)

Residents of Hyde Court.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

15th April 2026.

Inspector

C. Daly.

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History.....	8
5.0	Policy Context.....	9
6.0	The Appeal	14
7.0	Assessment	18
8.0	EIA Screening.....	30
9.0	AA Screening.....	30
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	31
11.0	Recommendation.....	31
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	32
13.0	Conditions.....	32
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	42
	Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	45
	Appendix 3: AA Screening	48

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject site, of area 1.159ha., consists of a two storey detached dwelling house located towards the rear of the site together with driveway. The mainly grass covered site slopes modestly uphill from front to rear. The rectangular site is lined by mature boundaries on three sides with the boundary facing Golf Links Road to the west lined by a modest height fence and from which the vehicular access is taken. There are overhead utility lines traversing the site to the rear of the existing dwelling. There is an existing side agricultural access gate towards the rear of the site on to Hyde Court.

1.2. To the east, there is a low density housing estate called Hyde Court which consists of two storey detached dwellings. Adjacent to the south there is a detached two storey dwelling located close to Golf Links Road. Opposite the site to the west, there is a line of detached two storey dwellings set back from the road. Opposite the adjacent access road to Hyde Court to the north of the site is Sacred Heart Hospital and Care Home. There is a line of mature tall trees along the hospital site's southern boundary with Hyde Court.

1.3. On the date of my visit, construction was underway on the hospital site close to its southern boundary consisting of some two storey buildings. The site is accessed from local road, L1812, which is a suburban type road within the environs of Roscommon town. The speed limit along Golf Links Road adjacent to the site is 60km per hour and the speed limit along Hyde Court is 50km per hour. The site is c.1.1km south of the town centre.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:

- Demolition of the existing dwelling house.
- Construction of 20 no. dwellings consisting of 7 no. three bed single storey dwellings, 10 no. three bed two storey semi-detached dwellings and three no. three bed two storey terraced dwellings.

- The four units along Golf Links Road would be directly accessed by individual accesses from this road. The main entrance to the scheme would be from Hyde Court which would serve 13 houses and the three houses adjacent to the Hyde Court estate would have individual direct accesses from Hyde Court. The layout provides for potential future access to the south.

2.2. Following F.I., the housing units proposed include 7 no. three bed single storey dwellings, 10 no. three bed two storey dwellings and three no. two bed single storey dwellings. A new detached unit was proposed at the west side of the open space and one of the units towards the terraced south-east corner was omitted such that the remaining two units became semi-detached. The access arrangement for the four houses facing Golf Links Road was changed to a shared single access.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Roscommon County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to (1) the design and layout of the scheme as the P.A. had concerns in relation to placemaking including regarding multiple entrances on to both roads, the rear facing of some units on to the open space, street making, uniform design, absence of shared traffic spaces, active travel details and the animation of the street level; (2) statement of compliance with the Compact Settlement Guidelines Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking, (3) compliance statement regarding universal design, (4) Stage 1 / 2 Road Safety Audit for the revised design, (5) statement of compliance with DMURS, (6) a swept path analysis of the internal road network, (7) revised proposals for surface water management, (8) a Tier 2 Construction and Demolition Waste Resource Management Plan, (9) an assessment of the building for demolition, (10) a pre-connection enquiry from Uisce Éireann, (11) evidence of engagement with service provider in relation to overhead utility lines and (12) phasing plan for all elements.

Following F.I., the P.A. decided to grant permission subject to 34 no. conditions. Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2 requires the omission of units 1, 2 and 17 and replacement with public open space, reorientation of units 3 and 4 through 90 degrees clockwise to face a continuous linear row with units 5 to 14 facing Hyde Court, the omission of vehicular access from Golf Links Road, a re-design of unit 14 to introduce dual aspect and with animation to the north and east, a redesign of the reoriented unit 3 for animation on both north and west elevations.
- Condition no. 3 requires detailed landscaping proposals including boundary treatments for agreement.
- Condition no. 4 requires a revised phasing scheme for agreement.
- Condition no. 7 requires the submission of comprehensive lighting proposals.
- Condition no. 8 requires the submission of a schedule of works on or impacting the adjoining public road for agreement.
- Condition no. 13 requires a minimum of 10% universally designed units.
- Condition no. 14 requires 20% of car parking spaces to be provided with car charging facilities.
- Condition no. 18 requires that all works be carried out in accordance with DMURS.
- Condition no. 20 requires that details of a management company and scheme be submitted for agreement.
- Condition no. 22 requires noise limits in relation to construction.
- Condition no. 23 requires all services to be placed underground.
- Condition no. 28 requires measures in the event that bats are discovered during building demolition or tree felling.
- Condition no. 32 requires the payment of a bond to secure the provision and completion of infrastructure.

3.1.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

The initial Planner's Report noted the site zoning for 'Existing Residential' in the town LAP. While noting the zoning it also noted Policy Objective RN7 of the LAP requires that housing be delivered that reflects the traditional pattern of development in the

area while adequately protecting the amenity of existing residents. It noted no material contravention of the core strategy of the CDP.

It noted that the layout would not meet the placemaking standards of the Compact Settlement Guidelines by not forming a sufficiently legible and coherent urban structure or positively responding to the established pattern of development. It recommended that the applicant be requested to address this by reducing the number of units and revising the layout to reflect the existing frontage along Hyde Court while also having a relationship with Golf Links Road. It considered that the revised layout should enclose a central communal open space and be served by one single access point. It noted issues with the rear of properties facing the open space.

It noted greater detail is required for convenient pedestrian connectivity through the site. It noted a proliferation of access points to the site which it considered excessive. It noted that Hyde Court is taken in charge. It recommended F.I. be sought in relation to this and the need for a Road Safety Audit and DMURS compliance statement. It recommended F.I. be sought in relation to the issues noted in Section 3.1.1 above.

Following F.I. the second Planner's Report noted the alteration to replace the four access points to the site with a combined access off Golf Links Road and that the layout continues to include the multiple access points off the road serving Hyde Court. It noted the relocation of unit 17 from the south-east corner to the western side of the open space so there would be a dwelling directly facing the space from its western side.

As it noted the contribution of the population growth of the town, it recommended amendments to the site layout be made via condition including that units 1, 2 and 17 be omitted and that units 3 and 4 be repositioned to form a linear row with units 5 and 6 and with design amendments to the end unit facing Golf Links Road so that it has active frontage facing that road and to unit 14 so it has active frontage facing east as well as north. It considered that this would reduce the density of development so that it would appropriately reflect the character and form of development in Hyde Court while also omitting the requirement for a vehicular access off Golf Links Road.

It noted the submitted landscaping plan which proposes the removal of the trees along the northern boundary and eight other trees. It noted the planting proposed of

additional native hedging and semi-mature trees and it considered that the boundary treatment along Golf Links Road should emulate the stone walls and pillars at the entrance to Hyde Court.

3.1.3. Other Technical Reports

- Roads Department: 1st Report: No objection subject to conditions. 2nd Report: Revised proposals acceptable.
- Housing Department: No objection subject to conditions.
- Municipal District Office: No response received.
- Environment Department: 1st Report: F.I. in relation to demolition report and more nature based solutions for surface water drainage. 2nd Report: No objection subject to conditions.

3.2. Prescribed Bodies

- Electric Ireland: No response received.
- Uisce Éireann: No objection subject to conditions.

3.3. Third Party Observations

9 no. third party observations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- The demolition of the dwelling on the site is unsustainable with no justification.
- The proposed development is contrary to the site zoning.
- Negative impacts on visual and residential amenity.
- The scale and density of development is not in keeping with the low density area.
- Failure to comply with local plans and policies.
- Negative impact on local architectural heritage.
- Hyde Court should be landscaped with footpaths along either side.
- Multiple accesses along Hyde Court will create safety issues when Golf Links Road would be a more appropriate access.
- Issues with the main entrance and no traffic management plan.

- How would the internal road layout accommodate emergency vehicles?
- Absence of Road Safety Audit, Traffic Impact Assessment, Swept Path Analysis or visibility study notable.
- There would be significant loss of local biodiversity.
- Noted inconsistencies with the red line area.
- Failure to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.
- Overgrown vegetation creates safety issues for passers by.
- No connection agreement with Uisce Éireann submitted.
- Absence of calculations provided for the attenuation tank and absence of SUDS provision.
- The access and connection arrangements are not authorised and there has been no consultation.
- Misleading inaccuracies within the application.
- Material contravention of a planning permission.
- Issues with utility lines crossing the site.

4.0 Planning History

Subject site

25/60076: Incomplete application for 20 houses.

06/2136: Permission granted for extension and alterations to existing house and link to self contained elderly person accommodation.

Sacred Heart Hospital and Home

22/253: Permission granted for demolition of two buildings and construction of new two storey 50 bed community nursing unit and new single storey buildings, new entrance from Golf Links Road and 68 new car parking spaces.

5.0 Policy Context

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

Current CDP Policy

Volume 1

Chapter 2 – Core Strategy and Settlement Policy

Section 2.5 Population Projections

Per Table 2.2, Roscommon town as a ‘Key Town’ has been allocated 600 new residential units over the period of the plan and this assumes that 17.15ha is required based on a density of 35uph.

Section 2.6 Settlement Hierarchy

Policy Objective CS 2.5

Support the regeneration of town centre and brownfield/infill lands along with the delivery of existing zoned and serviced lands to facilitate population growth and achieve sustainable compact growth targets of 30% of all new housing to be built within the existing urban footprint of targeted settlements in the county. At least 40% of all new housing will be targeted within the existing built-up footprint of the Regional Growth Centre of Athlone (Monksland/Bellanamullia).

Policy Objective CS 2.10

Support the continued growth and sustainable development of Roscommon, to act as a growth driver in the region and to fulfil its role as a Key Town and to function as the County Town.

Chapter 3 – People, Places and Housing

Policy Objective PPH 3.3 *Require the provision of an appropriate mix of house types and sizes in residential developments throughout the county, in order to meet the needs of the population and support the creation of balanced and inclusive communities.*

Policy Objective PPH 3.6 *Require new residential developments in excess of 10 residential units to include a minimum of 10% universally designed units, in*

accordance with the requirements of 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design' published by the Centre for Excellence in Universal Design.

Policy Objective PPH 3.7 Support the development of quality residential schemes with a range of housing options having regard to the standards, principles and any specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) set out in the 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities' (2009) and Circular NRUP 02/2021 Residential Densities in Towns and Village.

Chapter 7 – Infrastructure, Transport and Communications

Policy Objective ITC 7.17

Limited direct access onto national roads may be permitted in transitional zones approaching or exiting towns and villages i.e. between the 60kmh and 50kmh speed limits only, in order to facilitate orderly urban development. Any such proposal will be subject to a Road Safety Audit. A proliferation of such entrances will not be permitted.

Policy Objective ITC 7.28

Improve the streetscape environment for pedestrians, cyclists, and people with special mobility needs by providing facilities to enhance safety and convenience, including separation for pedestrian infrastructure from vehicular traffic.

Policy Objective ITC 7.39

Ensure that new development proposals connect into the existing public water mains, where available. These will be subject to a connection agreement with Irish Water.

Policy Objective ITC 7.43

Require all new development to provide a separate foul and surface water drainage system and to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate in new development and the public realm.

Chapter 12 – Development Management Standards

Section 12.6 Residential Development (Urban)

...Communal (public or shared) open space should be appropriately integrated into the overall residential layout and should comprise of 15% of gross site area for green field sites and 10% for brown field sites. Communal open space shall be of a sufficient size to be functional and usable - narrow or incidental strips of open space shall not be included in this calculation...

Densities

In general, the number of units to be provided on a site should be determined with reference to the Guidelines for Planning Authorities on 'Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas' or any subsequent update. In achieving the appropriate densities there should also be an appropriate focus on the quality and location of the dwellings, as well as the number of dwelling units. Appropriate densities should be utilised in appropriate areas where the consolidation of the centres can be accommodated in a sustainable manner. The Planning Authority may use its discretion in varying these maximum density standards to take account of the character and context of respective settlements.

Naming of Developments

The names of new residential developments shall reflect local place names, particularly townlands, or local names which reflect the landscape, its features, culture or history of the area in which the development is located. The names of historical persons associated with the area will also be considered. The use of appropriate Irish names will be encouraged in this regard.

Section 12.24 Roads and Transportation

Section 12.4 Sight Distance Requirements

Local Road, setback of 2.4m with sightlines of 90m required.

Table 12.1 Car Parking Standards

For residential (1-3 bedrooms), Minimum spaces to be provided is 1.5 per unit.
Visitor Parking for residential, minimum spaces to be provided is 1 for every three units.

Table 12.3 EV Charging Point Standards

For multi-unit residential developments, a minimum of 1 EV charge point space per five car parking spaces (ducting for every parking space shall also be provided)

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

Section 4.3 Compact Growth

Policy Objective RN1

All residential development proposals will be required to demonstrate compliance with Section 12.6 (Residential Development (Urban)) of Chapter 12 (Development Management Standards) as set out in Volume I of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028.

Policy Objective RN 3

Ensure the delivery of compact residential growth that aligns with the growth ambitions and density ranges for Roscommon Town, in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

Policy Objective RN 7

Facilitate additional residential development in established residential areas, in keeping with the existing residential character of the area and adequately protecting the amenity of existing residential properties in the area.

Section 5.6 Residential Density, Mix and Design

In recognition of its status as a 'Key Town' Roscommon County Council will aim to promote the achievement of higher densities in residential opportunity areas, subject to site specific considerations, good design and adherence to urban regeneration and development management standards as set out in Volume 1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 and generally reflecting the principles set out in Section 4.0 (Quality Urban Design and Placemaking) and Section 5.0 (Development Standards for Housing) of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements - Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

Section 11.6 Existing Residential

Lands zoned as 'Existing Residential' are largely developed, but nonetheless have a degree of capacity to supplement and enhance the residential offering through for

example, appropriate infill and brownfield developments of a scale and design appropriate to the needs of the area and community.

New residential development, along with an appropriate level of ancillary community, social and commercial services are facilitated within this 'Existing Residential' land use zone.

New proposals arising in this zone must ensure that the amenities of existing residential communities are maintained.

Section 11.12 Roscommon Town Land Use Zoning Matrix

Under Table 11.1, for 'existing residential' zoned lands, 'multi-unit residential use is open for consideration.

'Open for consideration' is defined as follows, "*use which is 'Open for Consideration' may be permitted where the Planning Authority is satisfied it is compatible with the policies and objectives for the zone, will not conflict with the permitted, existing or adjoining land uses and conforms with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area*".

5.3. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024). (The Compact Settlement Guidelines)
- Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009). (The 2009 Guidelines were revoked by the Compact Settlement Guidelines)
- Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities (2007).

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.3km west of Lough Ree SAC and PNHA (site code 000440).
- c.4.1km north-east of Ballinturly Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 000588).
- c.6.8km north-east of River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097).
- c.6.8km north-east of Suck River Callows NHA (site code 000222).
- c.7km south-west of Lisnarragh Bog NHA (site code 002072).

- c.7.2km west of Lough Ree SPA (site code 004064).
- c.7.4km south-west of Derrycanan Bog NHA (site code 000605).
- c.7.5km south-west of Corbo Bog SAC and PNHA (site code 002349).
- c.8.2km north-east of Lisduff Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 000609).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal, on behalf of the Residents of Hyde Court, can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development is of a form, scale, density and layout more typically associated with lands zoned for new residential development and not aligned with the existing residential zoning.
- Under the zoning, development is required to respond to and be informed by the scale, character and layout of the surrounding residential development.
- The development conflicts with the zoning and would undermine the amenity and character of the adjoining estate.
- The landscape approach to Hyde Court will be completely removed including 10 mature trees, shrubs, hedging and the masonry entrance inscribed 'Hyde Court'. This would significantly alter the character and amenity of Hyde Court.
- The removal of the boundary landscaping along Hyde Court is unnecessary given the existing entrance on to Golf Links Road and no justification for this has been provided. This conflicts with the zoning and positive placemaking.
- Despite the F.I. request in relation to placemaking, the design failed to address the placemaking shortcomings and it exhibits a fragmented and poorly resolved layout. Units 18, 19 and 20 will be isolated and it is unclear how units 3 and 4 will integrate.
- The outcome in relation to the entrances on to Hyde Court and Golf Links Road is contrary to the F.I. concern in relation to the multiple entrances and these accesses extend beyond the scope of the land registry folio submitted with no lawful basis for same and it is not capable of implementation.

- There are access and road safety issues in relation to the multiple entrances proposed.
- The boundary with Hyde Court is an established habitat corridor and it offers visual screening, privacy and noise attenuation such that its removal will have a negative impact on local amenity.
- There would be a net reduction in local biodiversity with insufficient consideration given to alternative access arrangements to avoid this.
- The combined amenity and environmental value of the established boundary hedgerows is estimated at 150,000 and this is intended to illustrate the scale and significance of the loss.
- The development description fails to state that it proposed new vehicular access points on to Hyde Court and this is a material component of the proposed development. This has undermined the process including in relation to public participation.
- The EIA screening was inadequate given that insufficient consideration was given to cumulative impacts relating to the access strategy, traffic intensification, vegetation removal, biodiversity impacts, visual amenity loss and effects on residential quality of life.
- The Road Safety Audit raises concerns in relation to visibility leaving the access on to Hyde Court and the failure to demonstrate sightlines remains an issue.
- The RSA fails to deal with potential development of adjoining lands which would use the proposed access and granting permission is premature.
- The units facing on to Hyde Court fail to positively address the context and the established pattern of development creating a weak and visually intrusive interface with the existing estate.
- The proposed development fails to demonstrate a clear street hierarchy, pedestrian priority or compliance with DMURS.

- There are significant issues from the swept path analysis in relation to refuse vehicles having to turn into the opposing lanes and in relation to the absence of a compliant turning bay adjacent to houses 15 and 16.
- The matters deferred in the decision to post consent conditions are contrary to the F.I. request which required their resolution prior to decision.
- The proposed development is contrary to the zoning and would have adverse impacts on residential amenity, streetscape quality and road safety.
- Photos submitted of boundary with Hyde Court, land registry map extract and site layout plan extract.

6.2. Applicant Response in the case of a 3rd Party Appeal

A first party response to the appeal has been submitted on behalf of the applicant, Reimas Developments Ltd, which can be summarised as follows:

- Following F.I., the scheme was revised to address the concerns including through the introduction of home zone / shared spaces and traffic calming through design and the submission of the RSA, DMURS compliance and swept path analysis.
- The design accords with DMURS including via a 5.5m carriageway width, raised transition areas and shared surface concepts to manage speed.
- The layout provides 1,793sqm of public open space which equates to 15.46% of the site area meeting the 15% requirement.
- There would be substantial hedgerow retention and compensatory planting including 520m linear metres of native hedgerow and native semi-mature trees and biodiversity measures including wildflower meadow and pollinator friendly planting.
- In relation the zoning and policy context, the DMURS led design response improved street structure, legibility, open space quality and strengthened boundary/landscaping measures.
- The submitted Stage 1/2 RSA, DMURS compliance and autotrack swept paths dealt with specific issues and recommendations and the layout was changed.

- The landscaping/boundary treatments are designed to balance retention and screening with verified sightline requirements.
- The submitted 3D view shows the scheme as a coherent integrated development rather than in piecemeal elements.
- Road safety has been addressed through the Stage 1 / 2 Road Safety Audit with issues raised being addressed through detailed design and conditions.
- The RSA was informed by a site visit and the audit in accordance with TII standards sets out clear recommendations.
- In relation to the streetscape concerns, the revised design adopts a place-led hierarchy with home zones and pedestrian priority to integrate the development.
- The DMURS compliance statement confirms that the revised internal road, footpath and cycle areas accord with DMURS including by confirming a 30km per hour design character and raised platforms/transition zones.
- Swept path analysis was undertaken for both a fire tender and refuse vehicle and confirms that such vehicles can access and manoeuvre within the development.
- The matters for conditions are standard design detailed deliverables appropriate to be secured by condition and compliance submissions and do not undermine the planning acceptability of the scheme.
- Condition no. 2 should be varied to permit the original quantum of houses and a performance based condition requiring compliance with the agreed layout/amenity/roads/landscape parameters that secure visual amenity and proper planning outcomes.
- The appeal response includes the F.I. cover letter / response, the F.I. Site Layout Plan, the F.I. 3D view, landscaping package, planning conditions, Stage 1 / 2 Road Safety Audit, DMURS / Traffic and Transportation Report, Swept path – fire tender autotrack, swept path – refuse vehicle autotrack and proposed internal arrangements.

6.3.Planning Authority Response

- None Received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Density
- Demolition
- Residential Amenity
- Layout and Design
- Landscape and Biodiversity
- Access
- Infrastructure
- Other Matters

7.2.Principle of Development

7.2.1. I note the site is zoned for 'existing residential' development under the Roscommon Town LAP. I note that 'multi-unit residential' is listed as open for consideration under the zoning. In terms of the proposed type of land use, I consider this acceptable in principle subject to a detailed assessment in relation to impacts including not conflicting with the adjoining land uses and that the amenities of existing residential communities are maintained.

7.3.Density

7.3.1. I note that the appeal has suggested that the density of the revised development for the site is excessive and that the appeal response has requested that the P.A.'s

decision to omit three units be replaced with a decision that allows for these units on a qualitative assessment basis. In relation to the quantitative assessment of density, I note that the proposed development at F.I. stage is for 20 no. units on a site area of 1.159ha. which equates to 17uph. The P.A. decided to omit three units which would result in a density of 15uph.

- 7.3.2. In relation to policy on density, I note that the CDP refers to the 2009 guidelines. For smaller towns on edge of centre sites Section 6.11 of the guidelines refers to densities in a range of 20 to 35 uph that will be appropriate. On this basis, the proposed density could be considered low. However, the guidelines state that the layout, design and space should also relate successfully to the structure of the town.
- 7.3.3. I note that per the CDP, the population allocation and land allocation for zoning purposes is based on an average density of 35uph. I note that this would also suggest that the proposed density is low. I note that Section 12.6 of the CDP clarifies that the P.A. may use its discretion to take account of the character and context of respective settlements. I note Policy Objective PPH 3.7 refers to having regard to these guidelines such that, noting this and Section 12.6, I do not consider the CDP is so specifically worded that a material contravention would arise as a result of the proposed density in this context. I also note the flexibility allowed in relation to considering the impact on the town structure, which in this case, noting the significantly lower densities to the east, would allow for a lower density.
- 7.3.4. I also note that the LAP references the Compact Settlement Guidelines and seeks that development aligns with the density ranges therein. Section 3.3.3 thereof refers to the key and large towns (5,000+ population). It notes that densities of 30uph to 50uph shall generally be applied at suburban and urban extension locations of key and large towns. I note the revised density considerably below the 30-50 range noted above. I note that this is before step 2 which refers to taking into account issues related to area character, amenity and the natural environment which may result in density reductions and/or scheme alterations or refusal.
- 7.3.5. I note that the Hyde Court estate consists of c.25 dwellings over an area c.6ha which gives a density of c.4uph. I note the housing adjacent to Hyde Court to the south-east was initially permitted at a density of 14uph (reg. ref. 11/259). I note that Section 3.3.6 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines provides for exceptions "*in the case of*

very small infill sites that are not of sufficient scale to define their own character and density, the need to respond to the scale and form of surrounding development, to protect the amenities of surrounding properties and to protect biodiversity may take precedence over the densities set out in this Chapter”.

- 7.3.6. Noting this, CDP policy and that Policy Objective RN 7 of the LAP seeks to facilitate residential development in line with the existing character of the area and to adequately protect the amenity of existing residential properties of the area, in the context of my below assessment, I consider the revised density of development to constitute a reasonable balance relating to policy and the receiving environment. I consider this would be consistent with the site zoning and noting the low density I do not consider that the scheme would be more suitable for the ‘new residential’ zoning. While I note the quantitative density is significantly in excess of that in the Hyde Court estate, I note that current policy would consider this to be a low density for an urban area.
- 7.3.7. I also note that in qualitative design terms, my below assessment has noted no significant negative impacts that cannot be dealt with by condition. While the character of the development would be somewhat more urban in appearance than Hyde Court, I consider this to be reasonable given the urban location. I note it would be significantly mitigated by the landscaping plan and sizeable open space area to the front of the development.

7.4. Demolition

- 7.4.1. I note that it is proposed to demolish the existing two storey dwelling on the site of 191sqm. I note the Demolition Assessment Report submitted by way of F.I.. This sets out a plan for the removal of hazardous waste, controlled structural demolition, segregation and storage of arisings and disposal in accordance with best practice which I consider reasonable. In terms of potential asbestos or other dangerous materials, I note that such matters are regulated by other codes such that I have no planning concerns and I do not recommend a specific condition for this.
- 7.4.2. In the context of CDP policy on compact development and intensification, I consider that the demolition and replacement of a single dwelling by 17 units is justified in sustainable development terms. This would provide 17 new households with dwellings within the town boundary within walking distance of the town centre and, in

my opinion, would represent a significant improvement in terms of the sustainable use of lands zoned for residential purposes.

7.5. Layout and Design

- 7.5.1. I note that in terms of the revised scheme the appeal has noted issues in relation to the scheme layout and particularly how it interacts with the adjacent road at Hyde Court and how it relates to the Hyde Court estate. I note the applicant's 'Statement of Compliance – Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking' report which I consider generally demonstrates a reasonable quality of urban design under the assessed headings. I will assess the specific main issues that relate to the scheme layout below.
- 7.5.2. Of particular concern in the appeal is the location of the entrances on to Hyde Court and the three houses that would face Hyde Court to the west of the existing Hyde Court estate. The appellants have suggested that the three adjacent units would be out of keeping with Hyde Court. While I note they would be located in closer proximity and on smaller sites, I note they would be similar to the adjacent houses in Hyde Court in directly facing the street and with access directly fronting it along a similar building line.
- 7.5.3. In this context and noting policy for greater density and intensification of zoned lands in the town, I do not consider that houses 18 to 20 would be excessively out of character with the street or with Hyde Court housing estate. I note that the revised site layout includes houses 5 to 14 which would face north towards Hyde Court, and while set back from it by the area of open space, I consider that these houses would address the new space and the street to a reasonable extent while providing for an open landscaped setting in keeping with Hyde Court. I consider that this, as well as the intensification of the development of the site, justifies the removal of the boundary with Hyde Court.
- 7.5.4. I note the single access that would serve these units, in addition to units 15, 16 and 17, from what would be a new access for this proposed estate. However, I note the P.A. in its conditions omitted units 1, 2 and 17 and reoriented units 3 and 4 through 90 degrees so their front elevations would face north and they would align with units 5 to 14 to the east. This also involved the removal of access from Golf Links Road and the extension of the internal estate road to the west to serve these units. While I

note the applicant appeal response requested the reinstatement of the three units, I note the applicant did not appeal these conditions. Accordingly, my assessment is of the revised scheme as amended by the P.A. conditions only.

- 7.5.5. I note that the layout resulting from the P.A. conditions would provide for an extended line of dwellings facing north and an extended area of private open space facing the Hyde Court road to the north. In my opinion this would present a visually coherent and consistent urban form that would enclose the new street. I note that the open space area to the north of the east-west line of dwellings would function to visually soften the urban edge of the scheme as it relates to Hyde Court. In this context, noting the concerns of the appellants in relation to the loss of the trees, the current northern boundary and the impact on Hyde Court, I consider this would provide for the integration of the urban form of the scheme without unduly negatively impacting on the character of Hyde Court in the vicinity. I consider associated landscaping separately in more detail further below.
- 7.5.6. I consider that the proposed housing mix would provide a reasonable variety of dwelling types for such a small scheme.

7.6. Residential Amenity

- 7.6.1. I note the appellants have raised issues related to the impact on residential amenity in the vicinity, particularly on the Hyde Court housing estate to the east. In relation to separation distances, I note that ample separation distances are provided from adjacent lands to the south and east such that there would be no undue overlooking or overbearing impacts, and there would be no first floor rear facing windows directly facing such windows. I note that dwellings in the vicinity of the site would not be effected by a significant increase in noise by reason of the residential development or the loss of the trees and planting along the site boundaries.
- 7.6.2. I note that given the position of the development to the north of the adjacent dwellings to the south and south-east, there would be no undue overshadowing of these dwellings. In relation to the adjacent dwelling to the east, I note that given that the new adjacent dwellings would follow the same building line and would be single storey units, that I have no significant concerns in relation to overshadowing or overbearing impacts. I also note that the tall boundary trees along the eastern boundary are to be retained.

- 7.6.3. In the interest of visual amenity, while the layout of the new dwellings would be on smaller plots with 12 semi-detached units included, I do not consider that the transition to a development of smaller dwellings on smaller sites by comparison with the adjacent estate would be excessively different or out of character with the Hyde Court estate. I also consider that the locating of three single storey dwellings adjacent to the estate would aid in this transition. Should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to require the undergrounding of all cables crossing and servicing the site.
- 7.6.4. I note that at F.I. stage, updated floor plans were submitted including for house types E and F. In terms of the design standards of the proposed dwellings in the revised scheme for potential future occupants, I note that by reference to the 2007 Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities guidelines, that the minimum floor areas would be exceeded.
- 7.6.5. In relation to private open space for the new dwellings, I note no specific quantitative standards in the CDP. I note no significant issues and that compliance with the Compact Settlement Guidelines standards is achieved and substantially exceeded in relation to the rear garden areas to be provided and I note in qualitative terms the rectangular arrangement is such that the rear gardens would constitute useable private open space and that 15 units would be south facing and two would face east with no north facing rear gardens
- 7.6.6. I note that Policy Objective PPH 3.6 of the CDP requires a minimum of 10% universally designed units. I note the statement of compliance submitted in this regard at F.I. stage. I note that 10 of the units (single storey) have been designed to be wheelchair accessible and 10 units have been designed for general accessibility. The units have been designed in accordance with the standards set out in 'Building for Everyone: A Universal Design Approach', including, inter alia, in relation to accessible entrances, wider doorways and corridors and accessible bathrooms, such that I am satisfied that Policy Objective PPH 3.6 would be met.

7.7. Landscape and Biodiversity

- 7.7.1. I note the appeal has raised concerns in relation to the loss of the landscaping around the site, particularly along the northern boundary with Hyde Court. I note the absence of a tree survey and that there are no protected trees on the site. In relation

to the above site layout assessment, I note that the mature trees and hedging along Hyde Court would be largely removed and that the natural planting along the western site boundary would also be lost. However, I note the substantial compensatory planting proposed for the scheme and the landscape plan submitted at F.I. stage. The landscape plan provides for the planting of native tree planting including Alder, Birch, Crab Apple, Scots Pine, Wild Cherry and Rowan between 3m and 4m tall at planting stage and native hedge planting including Whitethorn, Blackthorn, Holly, Dog Rose, Guelder Rose and Elder is proposed.

- 7.7.2. The plan also provides for bulb and spring flower planting. It also includes a wildflower meadow. I consider this approach to be reasonable in an urban context where compact development is encouraged. This would provide for, notwithstanding the loss of the existing trees and hedgerow, planting in the vicinity of the northern site boundary. Should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to require the implementation of the landscape plan and for its extension to the area to the west and including the boundary treatments which I consider appropriate for a new residential scheme to enhance its visual appearance.
- 7.7.3. I note that the scheme layout would also provide for a new footpath along the northern and western site boundaries which I consider would enhance the public realm in the vicinity. I note that the area of public open space on the site for the revised scheme would constitute just over 15% of the site area consistent with the CDP requirement and which would be increased given the omission of the three units to its west.
- 7.7.4. Noting the extended area of open space in the north-west area of the site, I consider that there is scope to improve permeability by providing a pedestrian access and pathway through the open space in this area and this can be provided for by condition.
- 7.7.5. In relation to the appeal concerns in relation to biodiversity loss on the site, I note that there would be at least some loss in terms of trees and hedgerows although it is not clear that all of the planted boundary along the northern boundary is natural native species planting. I note the landscaping plan for the site includes a significant use of native species planting and also includes pollinator friendly flowers. While the loss of the existing planting on the site is regrettable, I consider that the applicant's approach

in this regard is reasonable noting the zoning of the site for residential development and that policy encourages intensification of development and compact forms and in the context of the proposed planting scheme I consider this to be reasonable.

7.8. Access

- 7.8.1. I note the appeal has raised road safety concerns in relation to the new proposed entrances and has suggested that entrances along Hyde Court are not required given the existing entrance from Golf Links Road where a different layout could allow for housing on the site. I note that the proposed development, as revised at F.I. stage, includes a new vehicular access from Hyde Court to serve 13 houses as well as new direct entrances for the three houses to the north-east end of the site.
- 7.8.2. In addition, one vehicular entrance was proposed from Golf Links Road to serve the four houses at the west end of the site and this included a 'home zone' area which consists of a shared surface area. However this was omitted by condition of the P.A. such that the entrance on to Hyde Court would serve 14 dwellings and there would be direct accesses to the east of the main entrance for the three other dwellings.
- 7.8.3. I note that following F.I. the Council's Roads section noted its preference for a spine road to serve the four new dwellings on Golf Links Road. This followed its previous report where it considered the previous site layout with four new entrances on to the road to be excessive. It raised no significant issue in relation to the principle of entrances on to Hyde Court road or significant road safety issues in this regard.
- 7.8.4. I note that the speed limit along the site frontage with Golf Links Road is 60kph with the 50kph zone starting to the north just south of the junction with Hyde Court. I note the submitted Traffic Report prepared by TPS M Moran consultants and how this seeks to address the F.I. items raised by the P.A. including the request for the swept path analysis. This concluded that a refuse truck and fire tender could access the development in a reasonable and safe manner, that turning areas can be accessed safely and that it is possible for such vehicles to turn within the scheme without reversing onto the public road. I consider that no significant issues arise in this regard.
- 7.8.5. I note the DMURS Compliance Statement submitted at F.I. stage outlines how pedestrians and cyclists are intended to be given priority. It notes the provision of continuous footpaths, tight turning radii and limited forward visibility. Noting this, I

consider that the revised scheme, if permitted, would reasonably accord with DMURS standards.

- 7.8.6. I note the Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit (RSA) prepared by Bruton Consulting Engineers submitted at F.I. stage. I note that it identified nine problems and solutions for each which, inter alia, include requiring removal of vegetation to accommodate the visibility envelope for the main site entrance. I note some of the recommendations require the agreement of the Council.
- 7.8.7. While I consider that the recommendations outside the applicant's control, such as traffic calming along Hyde Court, are desirable, I do not consider that their absence would result in a road safety hazard noting the adequate sightlines, speed limits, pedestrian facilities proposed and road alignments in the vicinity of the site. Noting the outlined solutions in the RSA, should permission be granted I recommend they be required for the revised scheme to be implemented by condition.
- 7.8.8. I note the potential for a link to the site to the south. Should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to avoid the creation of a ransom strip in the south-east area of the site. In relation to potential cumulative traffic impacts from the development of the site to the south, I note that the assessment of such potential impacts is not a matter for this assessment but would be required if an application for development was made on the adjacent site using access from Hyde Court.
- 7.8.9. In terms of the justification for the new entrances along Hyde Court, the applicant has proposed the site layout plan. I have noted no significant road safety issues with the access arrangement and changes to Hyde Court of Golf Links Road. I note that the appellants have a preference for no access along Hyde Court and no change to the existing boundary, as noted above.
- 7.8.10. I consider the revised access arrangement as conditioned by the P.A. to exclude access from Golf Links Road to be reasonable and preferable given that the scheme would thereby access a less busy road with a lower speed limit than Golf Links Road which is a distributor route for the town and which has a higher speed limit adjacent to the site. In my opinion, the increased traffic movements along Hyde Court and the loss of the northern site boundary would not be so significant as to result in a requirement for sole access from Golf Links Road or to result in a significant increase in traffic along Hyde Court.

- 7.8.11. I also note that Hyde Court road is a relatively minor access road, has a lower speed limit than Golf Links Road which functions as a distributor road in the town and Hyde Court is located off the main public road such that I consider it to be more suitable for access purposes in that it would cause less disruption to the main road. I note that the Roads section sought to avoid a proliferation of access points along the main Golf Links Road. Should the Commission be minded to grant permission, I recommend similar conditions be applied to those recommended by the Council's Roads section.
- 7.8.12. In relation to car parking, I note that each dwelling would have two in-curtilage spaces which equates to 34 spaces in total. Based on Table 12.1 of the CDP, I note that a minimum of 1.5 spaces per unit is required plus 1 visitor space for every three units. Based on the minimum requirement, this would result in 25 spaces for the units and 6 visitor spaces or a total number of spaces of 31. Noting that the total number of spaces would be marginally above the minimum requirement and that at two spaces per dwelling, the requirement for visitor spaces can be met by the spaces provided, I am satisfied that this would reasonably accord with the CDP requirements.
- 7.8.13. I note also that per Table 12.3 of the CDP, there is a requirement for a minimum of one EV charge point space per 5 spaces. This would give rise to a requirement for 7 such points. Should permission be granted, I recommend that this be required by condition.

7.9. Infrastructure

- 7.9.1. I note that the appellant has raised issues in relation to the adequacy of the attenuation provision to be provided on the site. As part of the F.I. response I note that, in addition to the original drainage and attenuation provision details, a revised Surface Water Management and SUDS Strategy was submitted. I note that this includes domestic soakaways in each plot, permeable paving for parking courts and home zones, localised rain gardens / bio-retention areas within the open space and attenuation sized for a 100 year storm event plus climate change allowance. It notes that this is consistent with the national nature-based solutions guidance.
- 7.9.2. I note that the Council's Environment department requested further information in relation to the initial drainage proposals to include more nature-based solutions and

had no issues following receipt of F.I.. I note there is an area of 300sqm of the open space marked for the infiltration attenuation to provide for 1 in 100 year event at a discharge rate of 5l/s. I note that the appellant has offered no evidence as to how the applicant's attenuation provision is inadequate. I consider that this matter can be dealt with in detail by way of a compliance condition requiring the final details to be agreed with the P.A.. Should permission be granted, I recommend a standard condition to provide for detailed agreement with the P.A. in relation to this matter.

7.9.3. I note that a confirmation of feasibility without infrastructure upgrade letter has been received from Uisce Éireann in relation to water supply and wastewater treatment such that I have no significant concerns in this regard.

7.9.4. I note the F.I. response provided confirmation from ESB Networks that the overhead lines on the site are to be diverted/undergrounded as agreed and I consider this satisfactorily addresses this issue.

7.10. Other Matters

7.10.1. I note the applicant's phasing plan provides for three phases of development with infrastructure in the early phase, dwellings and landscaping in the second phase and completion of remaining dwellings, final road surface, boundary treatment and landscaping in the final phase. Noting the modest scale of development, I note no significant planning issues in relation to this proposal.

7.10.2. I note that the Council's Environment department requested further information in relation to the proposed demolition be provided in the RWMP and following receipt of same it recommended a standard condition be applied. It also recommended a standard noise condition and hours of operation condition. Should permission be granted, I recommend standard construction related conditions in this regard to provide a reasonable level of protection of residential amenities and the environment in the vicinity.

7.10.3. I note the appeal has noted that the applicant, in the public notices, did not explicitly state that new site entrances were included in the application. I note per the Site Layout Plan, one site notice is shown along Golf Links Road with none shown along Hyde Court. The new entrances could be said to be captured by the wording *"together with all boundary treatments, road services and all ancillary site development works"* although I agree with the appellants that this would not be clear

to third parties from the application wording. I note that this was considered acceptable by the P.A. and that it did not prevent the concerned party from making representations in relation to the entrances. I draw the attention of the Commission to this potential new issue as it may wish to consider if this should be re-advertised to include reference to the proposed new vehicular entrances.

- 7.10.4. I note the submitted Construction and Demolition Resource and Waste Management Plan (RWMP) prepared by James Lohan Planning and Design Consulting Engineers. This deals with waste prevention, on-site segregation, waste handling and record keeping and seeks to carry out its functions in accordance with best practice. In relation to this, I recommend a condition similar to that applied by the P.A.. In relation to other construction matters, I recommend a standard construction management plan condition be applied should permission be granted.
- 7.10.5. My above and below assessment has addressed the substantive matters in the appeal and in relation to the proposed development such that I consider it reasonable to leave certain details to be agreed by condition in accordance with standard practice.
- 7.10.6. I note concerns have been raised in the appeal in relation to the adequacy of the EIA. I have addressed EIA matters below in Section 8.0 and Appendices 1 and 2 and I note that the proposed development is significantly below the threshold for EIA.
- 7.10.7. I note that the appeal has suggested that the site is not fully within the ownership, particularly in relation to the frontage along Hyde Court. Having examined the plans and particulars, I am satisfied that the lands are within the ownership of the applicant. However, I note that per Section 34(13) of the 2000 Act, that a grant of permission does not confer automatic authority to carry out a development.
- 7.10.8. **Conditions** – I note P.A. condition no. 2 in relation to the reorientation and omission of units which I recommend be included. I note that a Part V condition, condition restricting the sale of the house to institutional investors and development contribution condition are applicable to this type of development. I also recommend a bond condition to ensure the satisfactory completion of infrastructure in and around the site. I note the submitted Outdoor Lighting Report confirms that the proposed lighting complies with the relevant lighting standards. I recommend a standard condition in relation to public lighting to protect wildlife and amenity. I recommend a

naming condition be applied also in line with CDP policy. I also recommend standard conditions be applied in relation to an estate management company, construction to taking in charge standards and Construction Traffic Management Plan.

8.0 EIA Screening

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

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. See Appendix 3 for detailed AA Screening. 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 Lough Ree SAC (site code 000440) and Ballinturly Turlough SAC (site code 000588) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

9.2. This determination is based on:

- The absence of any direct hydrological connectivity between the site and the European sites.
- The distance to the European sites and the urban intervening landscape and habitats.
- The location within a serviced urban area with available capacity noted at Roscommon WWTP.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is located c.260m east of the Jiggy (Hind)_010 river waterbody (status “poor”) (IE_SH_26J010090) and is above the Funshinagh (IE_SH_G_091) ground waterbody (status “good”). The proposed development comprises demolition of an existing dwelling, 20 new dwellings and new entrances.

10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The relatively small-scale nature of the development.
- The incorporation of SUDS drainage measures.
- The proposed connection to the Uisce Éireann wastewater network with no capacity issues noted.

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

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site within the town boundary and adjacent to the built-up environment of Roscommon town, the provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022 – 2022 and the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030, the infill nature of the site and associated policy encouraging appropriate compact development, to the height, scale, layout and form of the development, the proposed landscaping scheme including tree and other planting and to the nature and scale of the proposed development with no significant traffic congestion or traffic safety issues likely to result, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would be acceptable.

The proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity noting the appropriate building height and scale, absence of overshadowing and overlooking impacts. It would not result in significant adverse effects on the ecology or biodiversity of the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 12th day of December 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The proposed development shall be amended as follows:
 - (a) Units 1, 2 and 17 in the north-west area of the site shall be omitted and this area shall be reserved for and laid out as open space that shall join the proposed open

space area and which shall also be landscaped and which shall include a pedestrian opening in the northern boundary in the area opposite house 4.

(b) Units 3 and 4 shall be reoriented by 90 degrees clockwise such that the front elevations face north and that the units form a continuous linear row of houses with units 5 to 14 facing towards Hyde Court thereby adhering to the building line to the east and enclosing the open space to the north.

(c) Vehicular access from Golf Links Road shall be omitted with the entrance replaced with a continuous footpath, landscaping and boundary treatment to a maximum height of 1.2 metres.

(d) The main east-west internal access road and footpath and associated turning area serving units 5 to 14 shall be extended to serve the reoriented and repositioned units 3 and 4 with this road terminating east of the western site boundary.

(e) Unit 14 shall be redesigned so that it includes additional east facing ground floor windows and/or doors.

(f) Unit 3 shall be redesigned so that it includes additional west facing windows and/or doors and it shall remain a three bedroom unit.

(g) Unit types C and D shall be re-designed to reduce the width of the front facing first floor windows to reduce their width by 30% for a more pronounced vertical emphasis.

(h) A revised house numbering scheme is required in line with the above.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3. The landscaping scheme shown on drawing number LP-01-FI (Landscape Plan), as submitted to the planning authority on the 12th day of December, 2025 shall be carried out within the first planting season following substantial completion of external construction works. The scheme shall be extended to the west to include an extended open space area (as required by condition 2) to the north of units 3, 4, 5 and 6 and it shall include a pathway providing a pedestrian link to a new pedestrian opening in the northern site boundary opposite unit 4.

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 five years from the completion of the development or until the development is taken in charge by the local authority, whichever is the sooner, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

4. (a) Car parking provision in accordance with the layout, finishes and quantity of spaces indicated on Drawing 002 (Site Layout Plan) submitted on the 12th day of December, 2025 and as consequently required by the changes required in condition 2 above shall be provided upon the first occupation of units in the scheme. The dimensions of the circulation aisles, car parking spaces and the details of the bicycle parking spaces shall be subject to the written agreement of the planning authority.

(b) A minimum of seven electric vehicle charging connection points shall be provided across seven different dwellings.

Reason: To ensure that there is adequate car parking spaces to serve the development, and to provide electric vehicle parking facilities for all likely users of the development in order to avoid on-street parking and congestion.

5. With the exception of the measures no longer required due to the scheme amendments outlined in Condition number 2, the recommendations of the Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit and of the Statement of Compliance with the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets shall be implemented in full.

Reason: In the interests of high quality urban design and traffic and pedestrian safety.

6. (a) The internal road network serving the proposed development including turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths, and kerbs shall comply with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works.
- (b) Footpaths shall be dishd at road junctions in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority. Details of all locations and materials to be used shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.
- (c) All roads and footpaths shown to adjoining lands to the south and north shall be constructed up to the boundaries to provide access to adjoining lands with no obstruction including the erection of any structure which would otherwise constitute exempted development under the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. These areas shall be shown in a drawing which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of amenity, traffic and pedestrian safety, permeability and proper planning and sustainable development.

7. Drainage arrangements including for the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the relevant Section of the Council for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall submit to the Planning Authority for written agreement a Stage 2 - Detailed Design Stage Storm Water Audit. Upon completion of the development a Stage 3 Completion Stormwater Audit to demonstrate Sustainable Urban Drainage System measures have been installed, and are working as designed and that there has been no misconnections or damage to storm water drainage infrastructure during construction, shall be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

8. Proposals for an estate/street name, house/apartment numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all estate and street signs, and house/apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority.

No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

Reason: In the interest of urban legibility and to ensure the use of locally appropriate placenames for new residential areas.

9. 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.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

10. The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company, or by the local authority in the event of the development being taken in charge. Detailed proposals in this regard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion and maintenance of this development.

11. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed at least to the construction standards as set out in the planning authority's Taking In Charge Standards. In the absence of specific local standards, the standards as set out in the 'Recommendations for Site Development Works for Housing Areas' issued by the Department of the Environment and Local Government in November 1998. Following completion, the development shall be maintained by the developer, in compliance with these standards, until taken in charge by the planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out and completed to an acceptable standard of construction.

12. 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. All existing over ground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

13. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

14. Artificial lighting shall be designed in accordance with the 2023 BCT Lighting Guidance (GN08/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night). A lighting plan shall be submitted to and agreed with the planning authority for approval, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To minimise disturbance-related impacts on protected species..

15. Prior the commencement of demolition, felling/works, trees and buildings with bat roosting potential shall be surveyed by a suitably qualified Ecologist who is appropriately qualified and experienced in undertaking bat surveys and in line with best practice at the appropriate time of year to confirm the absence of roosting bats. In the event that a previously undetected bat roost is identified and is likely to be disturbed, the applicant shall acquire a derogation under Regulation 54 of the European Communities (Bird and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011 prior to the commencement of the relevant works. Prior to the removal of trees and/or works to building, the bat survey results, methodologies for felling/works and any derogations shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: For the protection of bats, a protected species.

16. A detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking

during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport and safety.

17.(a) 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.

(b) Construction operations during the hours of darkness shall be kept to a minimum. If construction lighting is required during the bat activity period (April to September), lighting shall be directed away from all woodland/trees/hedgerow habitat that is to be retained. Artificial lighting shall be designed in accordance with the 2023 BCT Lighting Guidance (GN08/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night).

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, residential amenities, public health and safety and environmental protection.

18. 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 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.

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.

19. (a) Prior to the commencement of the development as permitted, the applicant or any person with an interest in the land shall enter into an agreement with the planning authority (such agreement must specify the number and location of each house or duplex unit), pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, that restricts all relevant residential units permitted, to first occupation by individual purchasers i.e. those not being a corporate entity, and/or by those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.
- (b) An agreement pursuant to Section 47 shall be applicable for the period of duration of the planning permission, except where after not less than two years from the date of completion of each specified housing unit, it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the planning authority that it has not been possible to transact each of the residential units for use by individual purchasers and/or to those eligible for the occupation of social and/or affordable housing, including cost rental housing.
- (c) The determination of the planning authority as required in (b) shall be subject to receipt by the planning and housing authority of satisfactory documentary evidence from the applicant or any person with an interest in the land regarding the sales and marketing of the specified housing units, in which case the planning authority shall confirm in writing to the applicant or any person with an interest in the land that the Section 47 agreement has been terminated and that the requirement of this planning condition has been discharged in respect of each specified housing unit.

Reason: To comply with Section 47 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000.

20. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to

any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

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

21. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a bond of an insurance company, a cash deposit, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, sewers, watermains, drains, car parks, open spaces and other services required in connection with the development, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

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

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

13th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500762-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolish existing house and construction of 20 residential units, road services and all ancillary site development works.
Development Address	Golf Links Road, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.
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?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	

2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ 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?	
☐ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	State the Class and state the relevant threshold Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units, and (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares

Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. Construction of 20 dwellings on a site area of 1.159ha (site is within “other parts of a built-up area”).
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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500762-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolish existing house and construction of 20 residential units, road services and all ancillary site development works.
Development Address	Golf Links Road, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.
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 resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require 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 of major accident and/or disaster, and is not vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The urban site with one dwelling is remote from sensitive designated sites with built-up area between the site and such sites.

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).	There is an adjacent hospital development to the north nearing completion, which if included, would not result in the cumulative threshold of development being significant relative to the development threshold to trigger EIA. While there would be some loss of trees and shrubs on the site, it would be a relatively small scale. Capacity available at Roscommon Central Water Supply Scheme and at Roscommon WWTP.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Nature of the development with no significant pollution at construction or operational stages. Negligible addition to wastewater treatment system, capacity available at Roscommon WWTP. Temporary emissions during construction. No significant operational impacts.
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. Include the following paragraph under EIA Screening (a separate heading) in the Inspectors report.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: Standard AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: PL-500762-RN-26	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Demolish existing house and construction of 20 residential units, road services and all ancillary site development works.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Urban serviced site. The subject site is c.3km west of Lough Ree SAC (site code 000440), c.4.1km north-east of Ballinturly Turlough SAC (site code 000588) and c.6.8km north-east of River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097).
Screening report	No
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant submissions	None.

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

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
Lough Ree SAC (site code 000440).	Natural eutrophic lakes with Magnopotamion or Hydrocharition - type vegetation [3150] Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210] Active raised bogs [7110] Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120]	c.3km to the east	No hydrological connection	No

	Alkaline fens [7230] Limestone pavements [8240] Bog woodland [91D0] Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0] <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355]			
Ballinturly Turlough SAC (site code 000588).	Turloughs [3180]	c.4.1km to the south-west	No hydrological connection	No
River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097).	Whooper Swan (<i>Cygnus cygnus</i>) [A038] Golden Plover (<i>Pluvialis apricaria</i>) [A140] Lapwing (<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>) [A142]	c.6.8km to the south-west	No hydrological connection and no ex-situ sites applicable	No

	Greenland White-fronted Goose (Anser albifrons flavirostris) [A395] Wigeon (Mareca penelope) [A855] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]			
Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone <u>or</u> in combination) on European Sites Not required AA Screening matrix Not required				
Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site				
I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Lough Ree SAC and PNHA (site code 000440), Ballinturly Turlough SAC (site code 000588) and the River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.				

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 Lough Ree SAC (site code 000440), Ballinturly Turlough SAC (site code 000588) and the River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The absence of any direct hydrological connectivity between the site and the European sites.
- The distance to the European sites and the urban intervening landscape and habitats.
- The location within a serviced urban area with available capacity noted at Roscommon WWTP.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.