



Inspector's Report

PL-500785-RN-26

Development	Construction of 4 semi-detached bungalows, car parking and all associated ancillary site development works.
Location	Ardsallagh Beg, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560542
Applicant(s)	Gerard O'Loughlin
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Gerard O'Loughlin
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	18 th May 2026
Inspector	Ciara McGuinness

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site is located in the southeast suburbs of Roscommon town, c.1.3km from the centre of Roscommon town. The site is located on the southeast side of a local road which is accessed off the N61 National Road/Athlone Road. The general area is characterised by detached residential properties on individual plots, accessed from the local road and from established estate roads. The appeal site is an infill site with residential dwellings located on either side on the site and to the rear of the site. Roscommon Hospital and Roscommon Mayo Hospice are located further to the northeast and east of the proposed development site.
- 1.2. The site has a stated area of 0.11ha and is currently grassed. A public footpath runs to the front of the site adjoining the public road. The front boundary of the site comprises an agricultural gate and timber fence. Boundary walls, hedging and fencing separate the proposed development site from the adjoining residential dwellings.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of 4 semi-detached single storey bungalows each with 2 no. bedrooms and a gross floor area of 68sqm. The applicant has noted that the design approach has been to deliver a number of smaller, self-contained houses as opposed to an apartment complex. Two no. semi-detached units (no's 1 and 2) are stepped forward broadly in line with the existing small cottage to the northeast, units 3 and 4 are located perpendicular to the rear of the front two units.
- 2.2. A total of 6 no. car parking spaces are proposed to be located to the front of the development perpendicular to the footpath.
- 2.3. The proposed development will connect to the public mains and public sewer. The design of the scheme also proposes best practice in terms of SuDS drainage.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse permission for the following reasons;

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, design and configuration constitutes overdevelopment and would in part, give rise to an unacceptable pattern of backland development in this area. The proposed development fails to appropriately respond to its proposed urban context. The proposed development would by itself and by reason of the precedent it would set for other development of a similar nature, result in inappropriate and disorderly development and would be injurious to the residential amenity of existing proximate properties and the surrounding area. The proposed development is, as a consequence, contrary to the provisions of Section 12.6 (Residential Development (Urban)) and Section 12.11 (Backland Development) of the current Roscommon County Development Plan (2022-2028) (Volume 1). In addition, the proposed development is contrary to Policy Objective RN 7 of the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 which requires additional residential development in established residential areas to be in keeping with the existing residential character of the area and to adequately protect the amenity of existing residential properties in the area. The proposed development would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the proposed access arrangements, resultant vehicular movements and traffic circulation and car parking arrangements, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to undue and conflicting traffic movements both on site and on the public road. The proposed development, if permitted, therefore has the potential to give rise to an undue adverse impact on traffic movements and public safety at this location. The proposed development would accordingly have the potential to endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report (dated 20/02/2026) considers that the proposed development does not reflect the form and character of development in the vicinity of the site and

by reason of overall layout does not meet the standard of urban place making under the provisions of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and Policy Objective RN7 of the Roscommon Local Area Plan. The development if permitted would result in an unacceptable form of backland development in the rear of the site, capable of creating both an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining properties and an undesirable precedent for similar inappropriate developments in the area. It is recommended that permission be refused.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads Department – have outlined concerns regarding vehicles reversing onto the public road, proposed parking near the adjacent vehicular access points and access arrangement for emergency vehicles.

Environment Department – Recommends that in the event of a grant of permission, that a condition is attached requiring the applicant to prepare and submit a Resource Waste Management Plan, and to adhere to noise emission limits during construction.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann – Confirmed that a Confirmation of Feasibility has been issued. Requested the attachment of standard Uisce Eireann conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None

4.0 Planning History

None.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Roscommon County Development Plan

The site is located in Roscommon town which has been identified as a ‘Key Town’ in the county’s settlement hierarchy. The following section of the Development Plan are considered relevant.

12.6 Residential Development (Urban)

The Design Standards on urban development seek to assist in achieving positive urban placemaking and enhance a sense of place with access to services and amenities with a high quality of life for all.

It is acknowledged that the development of infill, brownfield and backland sites presents additional design challenges when compared to a greenfield site. In order to assist development, the application of policies and development standards shall allow for a degree of flexibility, focusing on design led and performance-based outcomes, rather than applying absolute requirements in all cases.

12.11 Backland Development

Backland development will not normally be permitted on residential sites in the suburban or rural situation as such development, including the construction of extra dwellings in gardens, can result in inappropriate and disorderly development and can have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of adjoining properties.

This may also result in the overloading of infrastructure and in missed opportunities for integrated renewal.

Backland development will be considered in cases where Local Area Plans/Settlement Plans are amenable to such development as a means of renewing derelict or underutilised urban lands. Backland development will be given consideration where the following criteria can be satisfied:

- access arrangements would not significantly increase noise and disturbance to existing dwellings;
- Adequate provision of off-street parking;
- Adequate provision of private amenity space;
- The scale and design of the dwelling is compatible with the character of the buildings in the surrounding area;
- The development will not give rise to overshadowing;
- Existing trees or natural features are retained, where possible.

In the event that a development is proposed on a portion of a larger plot of land in a backland location, an indicative layout of the overall development intentions for the wider land will be required.

Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030

The lands are zoned 'Existing Residential' under the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030.

The LAP notes that 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.

The following objective is relevant;

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.

5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024

The guidelines, hereafter referred to as the Compact Settlement Guidelines, set out a context to create higher density settlements to underpin sustainable development principles.

Section 3.3 of the guidelines contains Table 3.5 which defines categories of urban areas within 'Key Towns'. 'Key Town – Suburban/ Urban Extension' describes suburban areas as comprising low density car orientated residential areas constructed at the edge of the town, while urban extension refers to greenfield lands at the edge of the existing built-up footprint that are zoned for mixed-use (including residential) development. For such suburban locations, the guidelines state that densities in the range of 30dph-50dph should be applied and that densities up to 80dph are to be open for consideration at 'accessible' Key Towns – Suburban/ Urban

Extension locations. Section 3.3.6 addresses exceptional circumstances in the context of density requirements.

The guidelines encourage the following approaches of relevance:

- Realise opportunities for adaptation, reuse and intensification of existing buildings and for incremental brownfield and infill development.
- Deliver brownfield and infill development at scale at suitable strategic and sustainable development locations within the existing built-up footprint of the city and suburbs area or metropolitan towns.
- The quantum of car parking in new developments should be minimised to manage travel demand and to ensure that vehicular movement does not impede active modes of travel or have undue prominence within the public realm.(Quantum requirements outlined in SPPR 3)
- SPPR 1 – Separation Distances – ‘minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level’.
- Policy and Objective 5.1 - Public Open Space – ‘In some circumstances a planning authority might decide to set aside (in part or whole) the public open space requirement arising under the development plan’.....’In such circumstances, the planning authority may seek a financial contribution within the terms of Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) in lieu of provision within an application site’.
- SPPR 4 - Cycle Parking and Storage – ‘all new housing schemes (including mixed-use schemes that include housing) include safe and secure cycle storage facilities to meet the needs of residents and visitors’.
- Section 5.3.7 – Daylight – This section proposes that planning authorities 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 development.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Lough Ree SAC – c.2.6km to the east of the site

Lough Ree pNHA – c.2.6km to the east of the site

6.0 **EIA Screening**

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

7.0 **The Appeal**

7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The appeal is a first party appeal by the applicant. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows;

Refusal Reason 1

- The scale, design and configuration of four small bungalows does not constitute over development and an appropriately zoned serviced site.
- All applicable development management standards have been achieved.
- The configuration of the houses will deliver an infill scheme that is more people friendly, where residents (likely older people) can enjoy private and semi-private open space without being dominated by internal streets and cars.
- There have been no third-party objections to the houses.
- While policy RN7 is quoted in the refusal reason, it is respectfully argued that that the design is respectful to the prevailing pattern of development in the area.

- The Planner's statement that the development is not aligned with the Compact Settlement Guidelines is a general statement and has not been qualified in any way.
- There is no mention of the Compact Settlement Guidelines in the refusal reason despite suggestions it was not aligned with same.
- There are many examples of similar projects on larger infill sites where an element of backland development occurs. Reference is made to schemes in Kildare and Fingal which are included in Appendix A of the appeal.

Refusal Reason 2

- The Refusal reason is contrary to the conclusions and recommendations of the road engineer who broadly accepted the arrangement and concluded by presenting planning conditions for a grant of permission.
- The road is cul de sac. Roscommon Hospital and Roscommon Mayo Hospice lie to the east of the site, and any associated traffic will not pass the site.
- Traffic volumes in the area are very low.
- There is no entrance across from the site and therefore no conflicting movements.
- Two areas of grouped spaces (3 spaces in each area) on a local street are not uncommon in suburban or urban areas.
- The Planning Authority have no factual reason/evidence in support of their refusal based on public safety/traffic hazard.
- Examples of existing perpendicular parking off streets in Roscommon are provided in appendix B of the response.
- Roscommon County Council has recently constructed an infill development of 10 units at Windmill Drive, Elphin with a comparable parking arrangement
- The applicant is open to reconfiguration, including reduced parking if deemed appropriate by the Commission.
- Utility providers can remove/relocate the utility pole to the front of the site.

- There is no evidence to substantiate the concerns over access for emergency vehicles. A fire brigade can get within 40m of the furthest most unit (unit 4).

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

None

7.3. **Observations**

None

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s 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:

- Design/Layout
- Traffic Hazard

8.2. **Design/Layout**

8.2.1. The proposed development is for 4 no. semi-detached units, two fronting onto the local road and a further two located to the rear of these, perpendicular to the prevailing building line. I note the appeal site is the only vacant site in the immediate locality, with all other adjoining plots of a similar size containing single residential units in a typical suburban style area.

8.2.2. The first reason for refusal cited by the Planning Authority considers that the proposed development by reason of its scale, design and configuration constitutes overdevelopment and would in part, give rise to an unacceptable pattern of backland development in this area. The proposed development is also considered to fail to appropriately respond to its urban context.

8.2.3. The applicant in the grounds of appeal considers that the scale, design and configuration of four small bungalows does not constitute over development on appropriately zoned serviced site. The grounds of appeal note that all applicable

development management standards have been achieved and furthermore, there have been no third-party objections to the proposed development.

8.2.4. I have reviewed the proposed site layout, and I consider that the footprint of the proposed structures and their orientation and general design would sit uncomfortably within the site. While an increase in density above prevailing may be possible on the site, the proposed development does not represent an innovative architectural response to the site and has not considered established building lines. In my opinion the backland element of the development (Units 3 and 4), does not complement that character of the area and does not achieve a coherent and legible form. The proposed development represents haphazard backland development, out of character with its surroundings.

8.2.5. I note the grounds of appeal queries how the proposed development is not aligned with the Compact Settlement Guidelines. I note that while the Compact Settlement Guidelines promote an increase in density and compact growth, Section 4 of the Guidelines relates to Quality Urban Design and Place Making. One of the key indicators of Quality Urban Design and Place Making is Responsive Built Form. The guidelines note that built form refers to the layout, position and composition of buildings and to how buildings address streets and open spaces and that this is a key element in ensuring the creation of attractive and well-designed settlements. In this regard, a number of key principles are listed for consideration of individual planning applications. I do not consider that the proposed development complies with these principles which, inter alia, require new developments to *'support the formation of a legible and coherent urban structure'*

8.2.6. Having regard to the above assessment, I agree with the refusal reason and consider that the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of Section 12.6 (Residential Development (Urban)) and Section 12.11 (Backland Development) of the current Roscommon County Development Plan (2022-2028) (Volume 1), and Policy Objective RN 7 of the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 and the principles of Quality Urban Design and Place Making as set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024. I recommend that the reason for refusal is upheld.

8.3. Traffic Hazard

8.3.1. The pattern of development, in the immediate vicinity of the site, comprises single dwelling units on relatively large suburban plots with on-curtilage parking. The proposed development provides for 6 no. car parking spaces to be located to the front of the development perpendicular to the footpath.

8.3.2. The Planning Authority's second reason for refusal considers that having regard to the proposed access arrangements, resultant vehicular movements and traffic circulation and car parking arrangements, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to undue and conflicting traffic movements both on site and on the public road.

8.3.3. The applicant considers that the Planning Authority's refusal reason is contrary to the conclusions and recommendations of the road engineer who broadly accepted the arrangement and concluded by presenting planning conditions for a grant of permission. I have reviewed the roads report. I consider that the roads report has not explicitly recommended a grant or refusal of permission either way. I note conditions are outlined which I consider to be standard in the event of a grant of permission. Notwithstanding, the report has clearly noted while minimum sightlines have been demonstrated *'the department has concerns with vehicles reversing out of parking spaces onto the public road in which visibility cannot be achieved'*.

8.3.4. I consider that the perpendicular parking spaces proposed would contribute to dangerous reversing movements on this road and would not be conducive to traffic safety. I note that the proposed stone wall boundary to the east of the site may also impede sight distances. The reversing movements may also conflict with pedestrians utilising the adjoining pedestrian footpath. Overall, I consider that the poor layout of the overall development contributes to the substandard parking arrangement on site.

8.3.5. The grounds of appeal have made reference to other precedent cases with perpendicular parking arrangements. In this regard, I note that each application/appeal is determined on its own merits having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment and the specifics of the proposed development.

8.3.6. Having regard to the proposed access and car parking arrangements and the resultant vehicular movements, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to undue and conflicting traffic movements on the public road. The proposed

development, if permitted, therefore has the potential to give rise to an undue adverse impact on traffic movements and public safety at this location. I recommend that permission is refused on this basis.

9.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located in a fully serviced urban area and is not immediate to a European Site. The nearest European Sites are located 2.6km to the east of the site.

The proposed development comprises the construction of a residential development as set out in Section 2 of this report.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- Taking into account determination by LPA

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

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

10.0 **Water Framework Directive**

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been carried out in accordance with Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive and relevant EPA guidance, including best practice in sustainable drainage design.

- 10.2. The development incorporates appropriate surface water management measures, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), designed to replicate greenfield runoff rates and provide treatment of surface water prior to discharge.
- 10.3. These measures ensure that there will be no increase in pollutant loading, no alteration of the receiving waterbody's hydrological regime, and no risk of deterioration in water quality or ecological status. Any residual risks identified during the assessment are capable of being addressed through standard mitigation measures and best practice construction management.
- 10.4. The proposed development will not impact on the achievement of environmental objectives for any water body and is therefore considered compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that planning permission should be REFUSED for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028, including Section 2.6 'Residential Development' and 2.11 'Backland Development', Policy Objective RN 7 of the Roscommon Town LAP 2024 – 2030 and the principles of Quality Urban Design and Place Making as set out in the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024, and to the existing character and prevailing pattern of development in the area, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its layout and design, would represent haphazard backland development, would constitute overdevelopment of the subject site, would seriously injure the residential amenities of the area and would represent an undesirable precedent for infill developments in the area. The development would, therefore, not be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the proposed access and car parking arrangements, and resultant vehicular movements, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise

to undue and conflicting traffic movements on the public road. The proposed development, if permitted, therefore has the potential to give rise to an undue adverse impact on traffic movements and public safety at this location. The proposed development would accordingly have the potential to endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.”

Ciara McGuinness
Planning Inspector

25th May 2025

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500785-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 4 semi-detached bungalows, car parking and all associated ancillary site development works.
Development Address	Ardsallagh Beg, 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
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	State the Class here

<p>be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>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?</p>	
<p><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.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><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)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>Class 10 b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p> <p>Class 10 b) (iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a builtup area and 20 hectares elsewhere. (In this paragraph, “business district” means a district within a city or town in which the predominant land use is retail or commercial use.)</p> <p>The proposed development includes 4 residential units and has an area of 0.11ha and is therefore subthreshold</p>

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
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: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500785-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of 4 semi-detached bungalows, car parking and all associated ancillary site development works.
Development Address	Ardsallagh Beg, Roscommon, Co. Roscommon.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</p> <p>The site is an urban infill site in Roscommon Town. Given the size of the proposed development, no significant waste, emissions or pollutants would arise during the demolition, construction or operational phase due to the nature of the proposed development. The development, by virtue of its residential type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster. 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</p>	<p>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</p> <p>The site is zoned 'existing residential' and therefore residential development is acceptable in principle. The subject site is not located within or adjoining any environmentally sensitive sites or protected sites of ecological importance. The site is not located within a</p>

<p>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>conservation area, and there are no protected structures located within the site/surrounds. Given the nature of the development and the site/surroundings, it would not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</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>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</p> <p>The application site is an urban site and is not located in or immediately adjacent to any European site. The site is located within a serviced urban area, and the site would be connected to public mains and foul sewers. I do not consider that there is potential for the proposed development to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects having regard to existing or permitted projects</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p>	<p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p>
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIA is not required.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">✓</p>

<p>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.</p>
<p>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIAR required.</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)