



## Inspector's Report

**PL-500823-GY-26**

---

<b>Development</b>	Construct an agricultural shed and and all associated site works
<b>Location</b>	Áit Tí Seonac , Moycullen Road , Galway
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Galway County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2561704
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	P.J McDonagh
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	P.J McDonagh
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> March 2026
<b>Inspector</b>	Kathy Tuck

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The appeal site which has a stated area of c.0.46ha is located within the townland of Attyshonock with access being provided via a local road from the Moycullen Road (N59), Co. Galway. The site is situated approximately 5.7km to the south-east of Moycullen and 7.3km to the north-west of Galway City Centre.
- 1.2. The site is currently greenfield in nature and bounded to the west by an existing dwelling. The southern boundary of the site is formed with a local access road while there is another dwelling situated to the east. The site location map submitted with the application indicates that the applicant is the owner of the lands situated to the north which are also in agricultural use.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. This is an application for permission for the construction of an Agricultural shed for Machinery and Feed storage purposes, Internal access roadway to shed and all associated site works.
- 2.2. The shed structure is indicated on plan as having a width of 22.219m, a length of 40.21m and is finished with a pitched roof profile with a height of 7.875m. It is proposed to locate the structure 157m from the road which bounds the site to the south.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

The Planning Authority issued a decision to refuse planning permission on the 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2026 for the following 3 no. reasons:

1. Having regard to the information submitted, the submission received from TII, an intensification of use, the absence of demonstrating compliant and

satisfactory entry and exit sightlines from the proposed entrance including visibility of the private access link road junction with the N59 in accordance with TII standards, DM Standard 28 and DM standard 30 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, the absence of Transport and Traffic Assessments in accordance to DM Standard 33a, in conjunction with the consideration of by reason of unsubstantiated traffic volume and type of traffic generated such as large axle movements that will be generated to/from the N59 by the development whilst taking into account the existing narrow private road carriageway width, alignment, road composition whereby development is proposed on a private road, the safety and capacity of the junction of the private road with the National Road is considered in contravention to National Policy and the Galway Development Plan 2022-2028 Policy Objectives NR 1, NR 3 and NR 4 respectively. It is considered that if permitted as proposed, the development would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the public road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, obstruction of road users, or otherwise, and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Based on the information received with the planning application, and considering the flood vulnerability of the site, the potential direct hydrological link to the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code: 000297), it is considered that the development has, in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary, the potential to adversely affect the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code:000297) and would therefore materially contravene Policy Objective NHB 1 Natural Heritage and Biodiversity of Designated Sites, Habitats and Species, Policy Objective NHB 2 European Sites and Appropriate Assessment, and Policy Objective WR 1 Water Resources, and DM Standard 50 Environmental Assessments of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. The subject site is located in a flood vulnerable area. In the absence of a flood risk assessment, and in conjunction with the application of the precautionary principle, as set out under the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines 2009, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the development if permitted as proposed, would not materially contravene Policy Objective FL 2 and Policy Objective FL 3 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to Ministerial Guidelines issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer provides for a description of the site and proposed development, sets out the planning history of the site, sets out relevant planning policy, provides details of consultee reports received, and provides for an EIA, AA and FRA screening determination.

The report within the AA Screening determination noted concern over the location of the site within a flood vulnerable area and the potential for a direct hydrological pathway between the proposed site and the European sites and a significant concern was also noted over the lack of site specific flood risk assessment submitted.

Further concerns were raised on foot of the report received from the TII and the Transport Section of the Planning Authority. As such the report recommended that permission be refused in line with the decision issued.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transport Section - Report dated the 21<sup>st</sup> January 2026.

The report recommends that in the event further information is being sought then the applicant should be requested to Demonstrate compliance to Dm Standard 28 and Standard 30 (a),(b),(c) regarding private road junction onto N59 on a

revised site layout plan with associated consents and informed technical reports in accordance with the stipulations outlined within Galway CDP 2022-2028.

The report also presents a reason for refusal which states:

*The private status of the access link road serving the proposed development joins the heavily trafficked N59 National Road with geometrical properties of a Type 1 all-purpose single carriageway where the maximum speed limit of 100km/h applies. Based on the information submitted, the submission received from TII, an intensification of use, the absence of demonstrating compliant and satisfactory entry and exit sightlines from the proposed entrance including visibility of the private access link road junction with the N59 in accordance with TII standards, DM Standard 28 and DM standard 30 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, the absence of Transport and Traffic Assessments in accordance to DM Standard 33a, in conjunction with the consideration of by reason of unsubstantiated traffic volume and type of traffic generated such as large axle movements that will be generated to/from the N59 by the development whilst taking into account the existing narrow private road carriageway width, alignment, road composition whereby development is proposed on a private road, the safety and capacity of the junction of the private road with the National road is considered in contravention to National policy and Galway Development Plan policy objectives NR 1, NR 3 and NR 4 respectively. It is considered that if permitted as proposed, the development would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the public road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, obstruction of road users, or otherwise, and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland

Report dated 14<sup>th</sup> July 2025 – requests that the planning Authority should ensure the following:

- protect the substantial investment being made by Government in upgrading national roads, maintain the intended transport function, traffic carrying capacity and efficiency of the network of national roads, ensure that traffic hazards for road users are not created and thereby maintain the safety of the network of national roads, extend the service life of the national road network, thereby deferring to the longer term the need to reinvest in further road improvements and the construction of new roads which would have implications for landowners, local communities, the environment and public expenditure, protect the routes of future roads, including road upgrades, from development.

### 3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None received.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

PA Ref 25/60798      Permission REFUSED to construct an agricultural shed for machinery and feed storage purposes, access roadway to shed and all associated site works and services. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. The private status of the access link road serving the proposed development joins the heavily trafficked N59 National Road with geometrical properties of a Type 1 all-purpose single carriageway where the maximum speed limit of 100km/h applies. Based on the information submitted, the submission received from TII, an intensification of use, the absence of demonstrating compliant and satisfactory entry and exit sightlines from the proposed entrance including visibility of the private access link road junction with the N59 in accordance with

TII standards, DM Standard 28 and DM standard 30 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, the absence of Transport and Traffic Assessments in accordance to DM Standard 33a, in conjunction with the consideration of by reason of unsubstantiated traffic volume and type of traffic generated such as large axle movements that will be generated to/from the N59 by the development whilst taking into account the existing narrow private road carriageway width, alignment, road composition whereby development is proposed on a private road, the safety and capacity of the junction of the private road with the National road is considered in contravention to National policy and Galway Development Plan policy objectives NR 1, NR 3 and NR 4 respectively. It is considered that if permitted as proposed, the development would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the public road and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, obstruction of road users, or otherwise, and therefore would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Planning Authority are not satisfied that the principle of the proposed development is acceptable at the subject site, as sufficient details in relation to the location of an existing farmlands as well as activities at the farm such as animal types, herd sizes and nutrient management have not been provided.

## **5.0 Policy Context**

### **5.1. Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028**

The appeal site is not zoned under the current development plan. However, the site is located within the GCTPS, in the Lake Environs Landscape, with a landscape rating of 3.

## **Chapter 4 Rural Living and Development**

Section 4.7 Rural Development

Section 4.8 Agriculture

## **Chapter 6 Transport and Movement**

### *Policy Objective NR1 Protection of Strategic Roads*

To protect the strategic transport function of national roads and associated national road junctions, including motorways through the implementation of the 'Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities' DECLG, (2012) and the Trans-European Networks (TEN-T) Regulations.

### *Policy Objective NR3 Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) and Road Safety Audit (RSA)*

Require all applications for significant development proposals which have the potential to impact on the National Road Network to be accompanied by a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) and Road Safety Audit (RSA), carried out by suitably competent persons, in accordance with the TII's Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines and TII Publications (Standard) GE-STY-01024 (Road Safety Audit) respectively.

### *Policy Objective NR4 New Accesses Directly on National Roads*

The policy objective of the Planning Authority will be to avoid the creation of any additional access point from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60 kmh apply. This provision, in accordance with the relevant TII Guidelines, applies to all categories of development'. Consideration will be given, where appropriate, for the facilitation of regionally strategic projects and utility infrastructure.

## **Chapter 7 Infrastructure, Utilities & Environmental Protection**

Section 7.9 Environmental Protection

## **Chapter 8 Tourism and Landscape**

Section 8.13 Landscape

## **Chapter 10 Natural Heritage, Biodiversity and Green/Blue Infrastructure**

Section 10.6 Natural Heritage and Biodiversity

Section 10.7 Water Resources

Section 10.8 Wetlands, Turloughs, Watercourses

Policy Objective NHB1 - Natural Heritage and Biodiversity of Designated Sites, Habitats and Species.

Policy Objective NHB2 - European Sites and Appropriate Assessment.

## **Chapter 14 Climate Change, Energy and Renewable Resource.**

Policy Objective FL2 - Flood Risk Management and Assessment

Policy Objective FL3 - Principles of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines

## **Chapter 15 Development Management Standards**

DM Standard 13: Agricultural Buildings

### **a) Design and Layout**

The quality of design and layout of the farm complex. Where possible new buildings, shall be located within or adjoining the existing farmyard complex. Buildings shall be of minimum scale and use of muted coloured materials shall be encouraged.

### **b) Residential Amenity**

The proximity of any existing dwelling house.

### **c) Public Road Access**

The safe access to public roads.

#### **d) Rural Landscape**

The assimilation of the buildings into the rural landscape by means of appropriate siting, external colouring, screening and shelter belting.

DM Standard 14: Agricultural Effluent

DM Standard 28: Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional Local and Private Roads.

DM Standard 30: Developments on Private Roads

DM Standard 33: Traffic Impact Assessment, Traffic & Transport Assessment, Road Safety Audit & Noise Assessment

DM Standard 46: Compliance with Landscape Sensitivity Designations

DM Standard 50: Environmental Assessments

DM Standard 67: Sustainable Drainage Systems' (SuDS)

#### **5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

- 5.2.1. TII Publications DN-GEO-03060 Geometric Design of Junctions (priority junctions, direct accesses, roundabouts, grade separated and compact grade separated junctions), May 2023

Section 5.6.2.2 Direct Access, tables 5.4 and 5.5

- 5.2.2. TII Publications DN-GEO-03031 Rural Road Link Design, May 2023

Section 2 Sight Distance, Figure 2.1

- 5.2.3. Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities' DECLG, (2012)

- 5.2.4. Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments, Transport Infrastructure Ireland, 2014.

These guidelines aim to provide a framework to promote an integrated approach to development, which ensures that proposals promote more efficient use of investment in transportation infrastructure, reduce travel demand and promote road

safety. Section 2.2 and Table 2.3 sets out the requirements for sub-threshold developments to determine whether a TIA would be required or not.

### 5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any Natura 2000. The appeal site is located c.350m to the south of the Lough Corrib SAC (site code 000297) and c.586.23m to the south of the Lough Corrib SPA (site code 004042). The appeal site is also situated c.4.8km to the north of the Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site code 000268) and c.5.5km to the north of the Inner Galway Bay SPA (site code 004031).

## 6.0 **EIA Screening**

The proposed development does not come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA, that is, it does not comprise construction works, demolition or intervention in the natural surroundings. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

## 7.0 **The Appeal**

### 7.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

The Commission received a 1<sup>st</sup> party appeal on the 18<sup>th</sup> February 2026 against the decision of the Planning Authority to refuse permission. The grounds can be summarised as follows:

#### 1. Response to Refusal no. 1

- Submission from TII/Intensification of use.
  - Proposal will not create a new access onto secondary road.
  - Indirectly linked to the N95 via a local road.
  - Hay/forage already grown and transported from the landholding therefore already actively farmed by applicant.

- Principle of agricultural traffic movements to and from appeal site already established.
  - Proposal will simplify operations.
  - Given inclusion storage of agricultural machinery – will reduce the amount of agricultural generated traffic movements.
  - Acknowledged that feed will need to be transported in bulk in winter – development will not result in an intensification of traffic movements.
  - If site had road frontage onto a county road it would not be refused – therefore road being local private road (formerly public road) should not mean it is treated differently.
- Satisfactory entry and exit – Development Management Standard 28
- Appendix 3 of appeal includes a sightline drawing – demonstrates uninterrupted sightlines of 215m to east and west at junction of N59 and local road.
  - Full compliance with DMS28.
- Development Management Standard 30
- Sightlines at junction of private and public road demonstrated on sightline drawing (appendix 3) – complies with DMS 30(a).
  - Use of road to serve the dwelling and agricultural lands long established:
    - Surface in good condition and applicant willing to maintain.
    - Nature of shed does not generate need for road repair/upgrade.
    - No works proposed outside of red line boundary.
    - Road will continue to be used as cul-de-sac.
  - Existing cul-de-sac adequate in terms of capacity/road widths/surface conditions:
    - Serving applicant for many years.

- Only means of accessing lands.
- Unsubstantiated traffic volume and type of traffic generated such as large axel movements.
  - During harvest season – agricultural movements to and from the site include vehicles that are intended to be stored in proposed structure.
    - Therefore, reducing agricultural traffic movements
  - During winter tractor will be used to remove hay to bring to other land holdings.
  - Overall proposal will not result in intensification of traffic movement.
- Absence of Traffic Transport Assessment in accordance with – Development Management Standard 33(a)
  - Proposal will not result in traffic intensification
  - Therefore proposal will have minimal impact on adjoining road network.
  - TTA/RSA/RSIA not warranted.
- Policy Objective NR1
  - Nature and scale of proposal and existing and established agricultural use at site – strategic function of N59 will not be impacted.
  - No intensification will occur.
- Policy Objective NR3
  - Proposal will generate small number of traffic movements – most traffic will be internally within the site.
  - Proposal will have minimum impact on adjoining roads.
  - Not a significant development proposal and TTA or RSA not required.
- Policy Objective NR4
  - Applies to creation of new access onto national road.

- Proposal served by existing access point on the N59 since 1982.
- No intensification of use as it is intended to simplify and improve existing farm related operations.

Therefore in conclusion, the proposal as this location is in compliance with Policy Objective NR1, Policy Objective NR3, Policy Objective NR4, Development Management Standard 28, Development Management Standard 30 and Development Management Standard 33(a) of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and refusal reason 1 should therefore be dismissed.

## 2. Response to Refusal no. 2

Appeal sets out Policy Objective NHB1, Policy Objective NHB2, Policy Objective NR1 and Development Management Standard 50.

- Site specific Flood Risk Assessment (appendix 5) and Appropriate Assessment Screening submitted (appendix 4)
  - Both demonstrate that there is no hydrological link to any Natura 2000 site.
  - Therefore construction/operational impacts can be ruled out.
- Appropriate Assessment concluded that no significant effects are expected on the qualifying interests or conservation objectives of the surrounding Natura 2000 sites, as a result of the proposed development in question, alone or in combination with the other plans and projects in the area, and therefore, a Natura Impact Statement is not required in this case.
- Refusal reason can be dismissed.

## 3. Response to Refusal no. 3

Appeal sets out Policy Objective FL2 and Policy Objective FL3.

- Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted (Appendix 5) and needs to be read in conjunction with AA Screening Report (Appendix 4) and Longitudinal Section (Appendix 6).

- SSFRA concludes that:
  - Shed's finished floor level of 8.5m OD.
  - Less vulnerable classification of the development
  - The very low probability of the 1:1000 event
  - The absence of mapped fluvial or coastal flood zones at the site.
- SSFRA concludes that the development is in a low flood risk zone (Zone c) and has a low flood risk of flooding/proposal is sustainable in respect to flooding and meets the requirements of the flood risk management guidelines (2009).
- Therefore, accords with Policy Objectives FL2 and FL3 of the GCDP 2022-2028.

## 7.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

## 7.3. Observations

None received.

## 8.0 Assessment

### 8.1. Introduction

Having reviewed the 1<sup>st</sup> party appeal and all other documentation on file including the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local and national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Response to Refusal Reason No. 1 – Traffic Safety.
- Response to Refusal Reason No. 2 - Appropriate Assessment.

- Response to Refusal Reason No. 3 - Flood Risk

## 8.2. Response to Refusal Reason No. 1 – Traffic Safety

- 8.2.1. The Planning Authority considered that the proposed development would constitute a traffic hazard given the proposed intensification of use of the site, the lack of details demonstrating the available sightlines at the junction of the N59 with the private road which serves the appeal site and the unsubstantiated traffic volume and type of traffic the proposal may generate. The reason for refusal stated that the proposal would therefore be contrary to TII standards and a number of objectives of the County Development Plan including DM Standard 28 - Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads and DM standard 30 - Developments on Private Roads and Policy Objectives NR 1 – Protection of Strategic Roads, NR 3- Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) and Road Safety Audit (RSA) and NR 4 - New Accesses Directly on National Roads.
- 8.2.2. In addition, the reason for refusal considered that given the absence of Transport and Traffic Assessments the proposal would fail to comply with DM Standard 33a - Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA), Road Safety Audit (RSA) & Road Safety Impact Assessments (RSIA) of the County Plan.
- 8.2.3. The appellant in response has stated that the appeal site is currently in use to grow hay and forage which is also already transported from the site to other landholdings of the appellant and as such the proposal does not represent an intensification of use and as therefore a TTA is not warranted. It is further argued that the proposal will in-fact simplify operations by allowing for the storage of agri-vehicles. The appeal has also been accompanied by a sightline drawing which demonstrates uninterrupted sightlines of 215m to east and west at the junction of N59 and local road measured from a set back of 2.4m from the road edge.
- 8.2.4. With regards to the concern raised over the intensification of use, I note that these lands are already currently in agricultural use and as stated by the appellant, hay and forage is already grown and transported to other landholdings in the vicinity of

the site. This was also evident to me on undertaking a site visit where I witnessed an existing entrance gate to the appeal site and tractor tyre imprints in the grounds. Therefore, given the current operations on site I accept that the proposal will not represent an intensification of use.

- 8.2.5. With regard to the requirement for the Transport and Traffic Assessment, Policy Objective NR3 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 states “*Require all applications for significant development proposals which have the potential to impact on the National Road Network to be accompanied by a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) and Road Safety Audit (RSA), carried out by suitably competent persons, in accordance with the TII’s Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines and TII Publications (Standard) GE-STY-01024 (Road Safety Audit) respectively.*” I note that DM Standard 33(a) of the County Plan reiterates the same as Policy Objective NR3.
- 8.2.6. Section 2.2 and Table 2.3 of the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments, Transport Infrastructure Ireland, 2014 sets out the requirements for sub-threshold developments to determine whether a TTA would be required or not. The guidelines state that the impact of traffic volumes may not be significant and the thresholds requiring a TTA may not be exceeded. However, the type and volume of generated traffic on National Roads may be of a nature to raise concerns about effects on road safety and road infrastructure. The guidance sets out evaluation criteria within Table 2.3, which should be considered.
- 8.2.7. In the first instance I do not consider that the proposed development which is seeking permission for an agricultural shed to be a significant development proposal as described in Policy Objective NR3 and having reviewed Table 2.3 of the Guidelines, I am satisfied that the development seeking permission would not meet two or more of the criteria as set out in Section 2.2 which would trigger the need for a sub-threshold TTA.
- 8.2.8. The access proposed to serve the appeal site is accessed directly from a private road and therefore no new access is proposed from the N59. While the private road

is connected to the N59, this connection is provided via an established entrance which currently serves the two no. dwellings and farmlands within the vicinity. Therefore I consider that reference to Policy Objective NR4 - New Accesses Directly on National Roads is not relevant in this instance.

- 8.2.9. The N59 has a posted speed limit of 100km/hr which in line with Table 15.3: Sight Distances required for Access onto National, Regional and Local Roads of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 requires uninterrupted visibility splays of 215m in each direction at a setback of 2.4m from the road edge. The appellant has submitted a sight line drawing (drawing no. 1 included in appendix 3 of 1<sup>st</sup> party appeal) which indicates that sightlines of 215m are available in both direction at the existing junction of the N59 and the local road which has been measured from a 2.4m set back. This drawing therefore clearly demonstrates that the sightlines available accord with et requirements of DM Standard 28 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 8.2.10. The reason for refusal also makes reference to the report received from Transport Infrastructure Ireland. From a review of the submission received I note that there was no specific concern raised but rather it requested that consideration be given to a number of factors all of which I have discussed above.
- 8.2.11. I consider that the development proposed would not represent an intensified use of the appeal site, would not give rise to unsubstantiated traffic volumes, would not require the provision of a new entrance onto a national road, and is not considered to be a significant development proposal that would warrant the requirement of a TTA. Furthermore, having regard to the sightline drawing submitted with the appeal documentation, the sightlines available at the junction of the private road and the N59 would accord with requirement of Development Standard 28 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. Overall, I do not accept the first reason of refusal set out by the Planning Authority and do not consider that the proposed development would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the public road or endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, obstruction of road users, or otherwise.

### 8.3. **Response to Refusal Reason No. 2 - Appropriate Assessment.**

- 8.3.1. The second refusal of the Planning Authority relates to the potential adverse impacts the proposal would have upon the qualifying interests and conservation objectives of the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code:000297) given the potential direct hydrological link and considering the flood vulnerability of the site. It was concluded that the proposal would materially contravene Policy Objective NHB 1 - Natural Heritage and Biodiversity of Designated Sites, Habitats and Species, Policy Objective NHB 2 - European Sites and Appropriate Assessment, Policy Objective WR 1 - Water Resources, and DM Standard 50 - Environmental Assessments of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 8.3.2. The assessment of the Planning Officer makes reference to the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report submitted by the applicant and states that Notwithstanding the information presented within the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, the Planning Authority having consulted with GIS Planning Viewer have identified that the subject site appears to be within a flood vulnerable area. The assessment concluded that having regard to the potential for a direct hydrological pathway between the proposed site and the European sites, and having regard to the precautionary principle, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that adverse effects on the integrity of the European sites would not arise.
- 8.3.3. The appellant within their 1<sup>st</sup> party appeal states that they have submitted a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment and an updated Appropriate Assessment Screening report which both demonstrate that there is no hydrological link between the appeal site to any Natura 2000 site. It is further stated that the AA Screening concluded that no significant effects are expected on the qualifying interests or conservation objectives of the surrounding Natura 2000 sites, as a result of the proposed development in question, alone or in combination with the other plans and projects in the area, and therefore, a Natura Impact Statement is not required in this case.

- 8.3.4. Having reviewed the flood maps available to me on [Flood Maps - Floodinfo.ie](https://www.floodinfo.ie) for the area I note that the Planning Authority were correct in their assertion that part of the lands indicated within the blue line on the site location map are located within an area at risk of Fluvial flooding, however the area within the red line boundary is located outside of the area at risk. I further note that this was indicated by the appellant on the site layout plan dated the 12<sup>th</sup> June 2025 which was submitted aspart of the original planning application documentation.
- 8.3.5. I have also undertaken a review of the updated Appropriate Assessment Screening Assessment submitted with the appeal documentation. The AA report concluded that there is no hydrological connection between the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code:000297) and the appeal site. From a review of the EPA Mapping System [EPA Maps](https://www.epa.ie/maps) I concur with the findings of the AA Screening determination. I have set out my full Screening assessment under section 9.0 and Appendix 2 of my report.
- 8.3.6. In conclusion, I agree with the findings of the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and consider the appellant has provided satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Lough Corrib SAC (site code 000297) and the Lough Corrib SPA (site code 004042) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites.

#### 8.4. **Refusal Reason No. 3 - Flood Risk**

- 8.4.1. The 3<sup>rd</sup> reason for refusal stated that the site is located in a flood vulnerable area and in the absence of a flood risk assessment the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the development if permitted as proposed, would not materially contravene Policy Objective FL 2 - Flood Risk Management and Assessment and Policy Objective FL 3 - Principles of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to Ministerial Guidelines issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

- 8.4.2. The appellant in response notes that the 1<sup>st</sup> party appeal has been accompanied by a site specific flood risk assessment which concludes that the development is in a low flood risk zone (Zone c) and has a low flood risk of flooding/proposal is sustainable in respect to flooding and meets the requirements of the flood risk management guidelines (2009).
- 8.4.3. As mentioned above, from a review of the OPW mapping system available to me I note that the appeal site, as per the red line boundary, is not situated within an area identified as being at risk of flooding. The OPW also provide for guidelines “The Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009.’ The SSFRA submitted makes reference to these guidelines and states that it has been undertaken in line with same.
- 8.4.4. The SSFRA notes that no mapped fluvial flood zone intersects the appeal site footprint and that costal modelling (CFRAM) for the Lough Corrib shows extreme water levels well below the proposed finished floor level of the proposed agricultural shed, which is indicated as being 8.50m OD. In addition, no pluvial hazard mapping indicates significant risk. The proposed development is not for the purposes of residential development but rather the storage of agricultural vehicles and hay and therefore is determined to be a less vulnerable form of development.
- 8.4.5. Section 4.11 of the SSFRA notes that given the proximity of the site appeal site to the floodplain associated with the River Corrib and the history pertaining to such, further investigation is warranted. Furthermore, it is stated that the topographical assessment shows a gradient towards lower lying lands, north of the location of the proposed development which suggests low risk of surface accumulation – the impact of increased impermeable surfaces would also indicate a stage 2 assessment would be required.
- 8.4.6. Section 5 of the SSFRA sets out an Initial Flood Risk Assessment – Stage 2 which aims to provide a more detailed evaluation of the potential floor risks identified for the proposed Agricultural Shed development with a goal to ensure that the development is designed to be flood resilient and does not increase flood risk

elsewhere. It concludes that given the less-vulnerable classification of the development, the very low probability of the 1:1000 event, and the absence of mapped fluvial or coastal flood zones at the site the overall flood risk including when climate change is considered low and acceptable and therefore the development is consistent with the Policy Objective FL 2 - Flood Risk Management and Assessment and Policy Objective FL 3 - Principles of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines.

8.4.7. Based on the information submitted as part of the appeal documentation, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of flood risk and that it would not impact any other properties, would not pose a public health risk and would not materially contravene Policy Objective FL 2 - Flood Risk Management and Assessment and Policy Objective FL 3 - Principles of the Flood Risk Management Guidelines of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development accords with the Planning System and Flood Risk Management Guidelines, 2009.

## 9.0 **AA Screening**

9.1. 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 the Lough Corrib SAC (site code 000297) and the Lough Corrib SPA (site code 004042) 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:

- Nature and scale of the works proposed.
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections.
- The Site-Specific Flood Risk Assessment undertaken by the appellant.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is situated at Áit Tí Seonac , Moycullen Road , Galway. The application is seeking permission for the provision of an agricultural shed.

10.2. The Attyshonock River is situated approximately 239m to the east of the appeal site and has a good status. The appeal site is situated within the GWDTE-Lough Corrib Fen 2 ground water region which also benefits from a good status.

10.3. 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 & ground water bodies 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.

10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works regard the scale.
- Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

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

## 11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that the decision of the Planning Authority be overturned and permission is GRANTED for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the established agricultural use of the site and its location within a rural area, the character and pattern of development in the area, and the modest scale of the proposed development, the existing vehicular access between the local road and the N59, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously detract from the amenities of the area, would not give rise to a traffic hazard, and would not give rise to any impact upon any Natura 2000 sites within the vicinity. 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 on 20<sup>th</sup> November 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 buildings shall be used for agricultural/horticultural storage and associated purposes only. The building shall not be used for human habitation or any commercial purpose other than a purpose incidental to farming/horticulture, whether or not such use might otherwise constitute exempted development.

**Reason:** In the interest of orderly development and the amenities of the area

3. (a) Water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including for the disposal of surface and soiled water, shall comply with the requirements of the

planning authority for such works and services. In this regard- (i) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of directly in a sealed system to ground in appropriately sized soakaways. (ii) all soiled waters shall be directed to an appropriately sized soiled water storage tank (in accordance with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended, or to a slatted tank.

(b) The building shall be provided with gutters and down-pipes and these shall be maintained in a working condition. Clean surface water run-off from roof areas shall not be discharged onto soiled yard areas. Roof rainwater and clean yard water shall be discharged separated in closed pipes to a suitable soakpit system.

(c) All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties

(d) The access driveway to the proposed development shall be provided with adequately sized pipes or ducts to ensure that no interference will be caused to existing roadside drainage. The above drainage details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interest of environmental protection and public health.

4. All construction waste associated with the development shall be disposed of in accordance with national waste regulations.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health and to avoid pollution.

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.

---

Kathy Tuck

Planning Inspector

20<sup>th</sup> May 2026

## Appendix 1

### Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500823-GY-26
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Construct an agricultural shed and all associated site works
<b>Development Address</b>	Áit Tí Seonac , Moycullen Road , Galway
<b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	<b>State the Class here</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. <b>No Screening required.</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. <b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>	<b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	

<p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b></p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2

### AA Screening Determination

<b>Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects</b>	
<b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>	
<b>Brief description of project</b>	Permission is being sought for
<b>Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</b>	[include size, scale, land take, proximity to European site, duration of works, measures integral to design – any key issues, e.g. emissions, disturbance,]
<b>Screening report</b>	Y
<b>Natura Impact Statement</b>	N
<b>Relevant submissions</b>	<b>None</b>
<p>It is noted that an AA Screening report was submitted to the Planning Authority on the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2025. The Planning Officer within their report stated notwithstanding the information presented within the Appropriate Assessment Screening Report, the Planning Authority having consulted with GIS Planning Viewer have identified that the subject site appears to be within a flood vulnerable area. Taking into account the potential for a direct hydrological pathway between the proposed site and the European sites, and having regard to the precautionary principle, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that adverse effects on the integrity of the European sites would not arise.</p> <p>The 1<sup>st</sup> Party Appeal has been accompanied by an updated AA Screening report in addition to a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment. In the interest of clarity my assessment below relates to the updated AA Screening report received by the Commission on the 18<sup>th</sup> February 2026.</p>	
<b>Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model</b>	

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests <sup>1</sup> Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections <sup>2</sup>	Consider further in screening <sup>3</sup> Y/N
Lough Corrib SAC Site code 000297	<p>Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae) [3110]</p> <p>Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or Isoeto-Nanojuncetea [3130]</p> <p>Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of Chara spp. [3140]</p> <p>Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitriche-Batrachion vegetation [3260]</p> <p>Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210]</p> <p>Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae) [6410]</p> <p>Active raised bogs [7110]</p>	350m	No	Y

	<p>Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120]</p> <p>Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150]</p> <p>Calcareous fens with <i>Cladium mariscus</i> and species of the <i>Caricion davallianae</i> [7210]</p> <p>Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220]</p> <p>Alkaline fens [7230]</p> <p>Limestone pavements [8240]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Bog woodland [91D0]</p> <p><i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i> (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029]</p> <p><i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i> (White-clawed Crayfish) [1092]</p> <p><i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea Lamprey) [1095]</p> <p><i>Lampetra planeri</i> (Brook Lamprey) [1096]</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106]</p> <p>Rhinolophus hipposideros (Lesser Horseshoe Bat) [1303]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Najas flexilis (Slender Naiad) [1833]</p> <p>Hamatocaulis vernicosus (Slender Green Feather-moss) [6216]</p>			
<p>Lough Corrib SPA Site code 004042</p>	<p>Pochard (Aythya ferina) [A059]</p> <p>Tufted Duck (Aythya fuligula) [A061]</p> <p>Common Scoter (Melanitta nigra) [A065]</p> <p>Hen Harrier (Circus cyaneus) [A082]</p> <p>Coot (Fulica atra) [A125]</p> <p>Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Arctic Tern (Sterna paradisaea) [A194]</p> <p>Greenland White-fronted Goose (Anser albifrons flavirostris) [A395]</p>	586.23m	<b>No</b>	<b>Y</b>

	Shoveler (Spatula clypeata) [A857] Gadwall (Mareca strepera) [A889] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]			
Ross Lake and Woods SAC Site Code 001312	Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of Chara spp. [3140] Rhinolophus hipposideros (Lesser Horseshoe Bat) [1303]	8.1km	N	N
Gortnandarragh Limestone Pavement SAC Site code 001271	Limestone pavements [8240]	11.5km	N	N
Connemara Bog Complex SAC Site code 002034	Coastal lagoons [1150] Reefs [1170] Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae) [3110] Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or Isoeto-Nanojuncetea [3130] Natural dystrophic lakes and ponds [3160] Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitriche-Batrachion vegetation [3260]	8.1km	N	N

	<p>Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i> [4010]  European dry heaths [4030]  Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (<i>Molinia caerulea</i>) [6410]  Blanket bogs (* if active bog) [7130]  Transition mires and quaking bogs [7140]  Depressions on peat substrates of the <i>Rhynchosporion</i> [7150]  Alkaline fens [7230]  Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]  <i>Euphydrias aurinia</i> (Marsh Fritillary) [1065]  <i>Salmo salar</i> (Salmon) [1106]  <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355]  <i>Najas flexilis</i> (Slender Naiad) [1833]</p>			
Galway Bay Complex SAC Site Code 000268	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]  Coastal lagoons [1150]  Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]  Reefs [1170]  Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p>	4.8km	N	N

	<p>Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230]  Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]  Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucopuccinellietalia maritima) [1330]  Mediterranean salt meadows (Juncetalia maritimi) [1410]  Turloughs [3180]  Juniperus communis formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands [5130]  Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210]  Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae [7210]  Alkaline fens [7230]  Limestone pavements [8240]  Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]  Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365]</p>			
<p>Inner Galway Bay SPA Site Code 004031</p>	<p>Black-throated Diver (Gavia arctica) [A002]  Great Northern Diver (Gavia immer) [A003]  Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]  Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028]</p>	5.5km	N	N

	<p>Light-bellied Brent Goose (Branta bernicla hrota) [A046]</p> <p>Teal (Anas crecca) [A052]</p> <p>Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069]</p> <p>Ringed Plover (Charadrius hiaticula) [A137]</p> <p>Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]</p> <p>Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus) [A142]</p> <p>Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149]</p> <p>Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (Numenius arquata) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162]</p> <p>Turnstone (Arenaria interpres) [A169]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Wigeon (Mareca penelope) [A855]</p> <p>Sandwich Tern (Thalasseus sandvicensis) [A863]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>			
Connemara Bog Complex SPA Site Code 004181	Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]	13.2km	N	N

	Merlin (Falco columbarius) [A098] Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140] Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]			
Cregganna Marsh SPA Site Code 004142	Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]  Merlin (Falco columbarius) [A098]  Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]  Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]	13.9km	N	N

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

[From the AA Screening Report or the Inspector's own assessment if no Screening Report submitted, complete the following table where European sites need further consideration taking the following into account:

- (a) Identify potential direct or indirect impacts (if any) arising from the project alone that could have an effect on the European Site(s) taking into account the size and scale of the proposed development and all relevant stages of the project (See Appendix 9 in Advice note 1A).
- (b) Are there any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water, wastewater etc. that would be implemented regardless of proximity to a European Site?
- (c) Identify possible significant effects on the European sites in view of the conservation objectives (alone or in combination with other plans and projects)

**AA Screening matrix**

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<b>Site 1: Name (code)</b> Lough Corrib SAC	Direct:	None.

<p>Site code 000297</p> <p>Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae) [3110]</p> <p>Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or Isoeto-Nanojuncetea [3130]</p> <p>Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of Chara spp. [3140]</p> <p>Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-Batrachion vegetation [3260]</p> <p>Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210]</p> <p>Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae) [6410]</p> <p>Active raised bogs [7110]</p>	<p>The appeal site is not situated within the SAC and from a review of the EPA Mapping system available to me there does not appear to be any direct hydrological connections from the appeal site.</p> <p>Therefore, I can conclude that there will be no direct impact.</p> <p>Indirect: The 1<sup>st</sup> Party appeal has been accompanied by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates that the appeal site is situated within Flood Zone C which is considered to have a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>I note that the appeal site is also situated outside of the identified flood risk area situated to the north of the site as per the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.</p> <p>The proposed shed structure is intended to be used for the storage of hay and machinery. It is also intended to utilize a suite of SUDs features which will deal with the increased surface water generated. Having regard to the separation distance of the appeal site to the SAC and lack of direct hydrological connections there will be no indirect impacts.</p>	
---	---	--

<p>Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120]</p> <p>Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150]</p> <p>Calcareous fens with <i>Cladium mariscus</i> and species of the Caricion <i>davallianae</i> [7210]</p> <p>Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220]</p> <p>Alkaline fens [7230]</p> <p>Limestone pavements [8240]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Bog woodland [91D0]</p> <p><i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i> (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029]</p> <p><i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i> (White-clawed Crayfish) [1092]</p> <p><i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea Lamprey) [1095]</p> <p><i>Lampetra planeri</i> (Brook Lamprey) [1096]</p> <p><i>Salmo salar</i> (Salmon) [1106]</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Rhinolophus hipposideros (Lesser Horseshoe Bat) [1303]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Najas flexilis (Slender Naiad) [1833]</p> <p>Hamatocaulis vernicosus (Slender Green Feather-moss) [6216]</p>		
<b>N</b>	<b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone)</b>	
<b>N</b>	<b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b>	
<b>N</b>	<b>Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site</b>	
	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Effects</b>
<p><b>Site 2: Name (code)</b> Lough Corrib SPA Site code 004042</p> <p>Pochard (Aythya ferina) [A059] Tufted Duck (Aythya fuligula) [A061] Common Scoter (Melanitta nigra) [A065] Hen Harrier (Circus cyaneus) [A082] Coot (Fulica atra) [A125] Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140] Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p>	<p>Direct: The appeal site is not situated within the SPA and from a review of the EPA Mapping system available to me there does not appear to be any direct hydrological connections from the appeal site.</p> <p>Therefore, I can conclude that there will be no direct impact.</p> <p>Indirect: The 1<sup>st</sup> Party appeal has been accompanied by a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment which demonstrates that the appeal site is situated within Flood Zone C which is considered to have a low risk of flooding.</p> <p>I note that the appeal site is also situated outside of the identified flood risk area situated to the north of the site as per the</p>	<p><b>None</b></p>

<p>Common Gull (<i>Larus canus</i>) [A182]  Common Tern (<i>Sterna hirundo</i>) [A193]  Arctic Tern (<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>) [A194]  Greenland White-fronted Goose (<i>Anser albifrons flavirostris</i>) [A395]  Shoveler (<i>Spatula clypeata</i>) [A857]  Gadwall (<i>Mareca strepera</i>) [A889]  Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>	<p>Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028.</p> <p>The proposed shed structure is intended to be used for the storage of hay and machinery. It is also intended to utilize a suite of SUDs features which will deal with the increased surface water generated. Having regard to the separation distance of the appeal site to the SAC and lack of direct hydrological connections there will be no indirect impacts.</p>	
<p><b>N</b></p>	<p><b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone)</b></p>	
<p><b>N</b></p>	<p><b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or project</b></p>	
<p><b>Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</b></p>		
<p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on [insert European site(s)]. 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.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>		

**Screening Determination** [insert into Inspectors Report]

**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 [any/ X named European Site(s)] in view of the conservation objectives of this/ these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- [Nature of works]
- [Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections]

**[OR]**

**Significant effects cannot be excluded**

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 it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone [or in combination with other plans and projects] will give rise to significant effects on X European Site(s) in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.

This determination is based on:

- 
-