



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-500877-GY-26

Development	The retention for a change of use from part of an existing dwelling house to a physio room including all associated site works.
Location	Coisméig Mór, Furbo, County Galway.
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25334
Applicants	Bertie Concannon.
Type of Application	Retention of permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal of permission.
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant	Bertie Concannon

Observers

None

Date of Site Inspection

23rd April 2026.

Inspector

Derek Daly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the townland of Coisméig Mór in the rural area of Furbo to the west of Barna and east of Spiddal in County Galway. The site fronts onto the western side of a minor road which in turn has a junction with the R336 Galway to Spiddal regional route. There are a number of houses located on the minor road including to the north and south of the appeal site. The minor road is relatively narrow in width and of a poor alignment but there are passing areas along the route.
- 1.2. On the site is a detached single storied dwelling with a site access located at the northeastern corner of the site. The remainder of the roadside boundary is defined by a boundary stone wall.
- 1.3. There is a parking area located to the front of the dwelling.
- 1.4. The site has a stated area of 0.180 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1.1. The proposed development as received by the planning authority on the 5th December 2025 was for;
 - The retention for change of use from part of an existing dwelling house to a physio room including all associated site works
 - The floor area of the retention is stated as 29.83m² within an existing dwelling with a stated area of 147.5m².
 - The development for retention comprises a reception area and a physio room with a toilet off the physio room located adjoining the southern gable of the dwelling.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The decision of the Planning Authority was to refuse planning permission. Two reasons were stated;

1. Having regard to the provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2022–2028, and in particular Policy Objective CD 1 (a), (d), (e) and (f), together with the established residential context of the area, it is considered that the development as proposed would give rise to a potential traffic hazard and would adversely affect existing residential amenity. The proposal is therefore considered to materially contravene Policy Objective CD 1 and DM Standard 17 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022–2028. Furthermore, the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar proposals in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The Planning Authority consider that proposed development would result in an intensification of use of an existing dwelling access whilst being at variance to Policy Objective NNR2: Safeguard Regional and Local Roads of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. 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.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning report dated the 5th February 2026 refers to the planning history, development plan provisions, submissions received and an assessment of the development.

The assessment focused on the provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 in particular Policy Objective CD 1 and also DM 17 and the applicant has failed to provide a justification for the proposed development and therefore the Planning Authority considers that this proposal is contrary to Policy Objective CD 1 and to DM Standard 17 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028. The assessment also considered the sightline visibility proposed of 25 metres is not in accordance with DM28. Intensification of use was also referred to arising from the

increased traffic movement arising from the development and impact on the public road network. The absence of a delineated parking area is also indicated.

Refusal was recommended.

3.3. Other submissions

TII in a submission dated 18th December 2025 requested that the planning authority has regard to the provisions of official policy for development proposals as follows: proposals impacting national roads in relation to stated national guidance.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1.1. P.A. Ref. No. 37421 Permission granted for the erection of a dwelling house on the site.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The statutory development plan is the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 4 refers to Rural Living and Development
- 5.1.3. Section 4.6.1 refers to Rural Areas under Strong Urban Pressure –Metropolitan Area and GCTPS (Galway County Transport and Planning Strategy) and that the areas as shown on Map no 2 reflect closely the characteristics of rural areas under strong urban pressure. The appeal site is within this area. These areas exhibit characteristics of growth in population at locations in close proximity to the larger towns and to which the residents of these rural areas commute to in large numbers. It is also evident from the analysis undertaken that there was pressure for development for housing due to the proximity to Galway City. The objective of these areas is to maintain a stable population base in rural areas within a strong network of small towns and villages.
- 5.1.4. Section 4.13 to Commercial Developments in Rural Areas and it is recognised that rural businesses and enterprises are an important source of local employment in the County. Many examples of fine rural businesses exist throughout the county. This

includes agricultural, equine, engineering/manufacturing, recreational, tourism, energy/renewable energy, and rural resource-based enterprises. Whilst the plan supports such enterprises and the diversification of the rural economy, it is also recognised that a balance is required between supporting rural based enterprises and projects and protecting the local environment.

In the first instance, new employment related developments are directed to settlements where services are available, and lands have been identified for employment uses. It is also recognised that there are instances where a development can be more readily accommodated or is more appropriate to a rural area. This can be due to a locational specific, or resourced based development, or a development of regional or national importance.

5.1.5. Policy Objective CD 1 – Rural Enterprises provides for consider and support the establishment of small scale rural orientated enterprises in unserved rural areas outside of town or village settings which can be accommodated in existing farm buildings or can be established on a brownfield site, subject to satisfying the following criteria:

(a) Compatibility and general suitability to an unserved rural area (primary consideration will be given to agriculture, renewable and marine resources, forestry, tourism, recreation or food production related enterprise activities and services);

(b) Scale of development (assimilate appropriately into a rural setting);

(c) Nature of development (raw materials sourced locally);

(d) Consideration of social and environmental impacts (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or rural amenity);

(e) The enterprise must not constitute a road safety hazard or have a major adverse impact on the road network, road capacity and traffic levels;

(f) Residential amenity (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity).

5.1.6. Chapter 5 Economic Development, Enterprise and Retail Development and section 5.8.5 refers to Remote Working in which people in certain types of employment to work in locations other than their main place of employment.

- 5.1.7. Chapter 6 Transport and Movement and in relation to regional routes Policy Objectives for Non National Roads include NNR 2 Safeguard Regional and Local Roads To safeguard the carrying capacity and safety of the County's regional and local road network.
- 5.1.8. Chapter 15 refers to Development Management Standards.
- 5.1.9. Section 15.3.4 Rural Enterprise DM Standard 17: indicates the Council will consider rural enterprises, and resource development (such as agriculture, agri-food sector, agri-tourism, commercial fishing, aquaculture, marine tourism, forestry, bio-energy, the extractive industry, recreation, cultural heritage, marine enterprise sector, research and analysis) and renewable energy resources (such as wind/ocean energy) in rural and coastal areas within the County subject to considerations of proper planning and sustainable development and shall include the following:
- a) Existing Buildings The conversion of existing farm buildings in rural areas for small scale employment purposes will be considered.
 - b) Agriculturally Related Industry New buildings will be considered in rural areas for the provision of agricultural related locally sustainable industry.
 - c) Farm-Related Business directly related to farming, such as the servicing and repair of farm machinery, land reclamation, drainage work, agricultural contracting etc., where it will not give rise to adverse environmental effects, have safe access and not be prejudicial to residential amenity.

The following information shall accompany any application:

- The type of business proposed;
- The nature and extent of the work;
- Reason for its location (e.g., justification on why it is not proposed within settlement centre, etc.);
- Anticipated levels of traffic generated by the proposal, accessibility, and car parking;
- The effects on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers particularly in relation to hours of work, noise and general disturbance;

- Whether the proposal requires delivery/shipment of goods and details of same;
- Arrangements for storage and collection of waste. (Materials used or goods manufactured, serviced or repaired in the home-based business must be stored within a building).
- No goods manufactured, serviced or repaired should be displayed so that they are visible from outside the site.
- Should not have any adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings.

5.1.10. Section 15.4 refers to Economic Enterprise and Retail and refers to Home Based Economic Activities and that home based economic activity may be considered. The use must be ancillary in scale and nature to the residential unit. Potential impact on neighbouring residential amenity must be addressed and minimised.

DM Standard 28 relates to Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads. Table 15.3 outlines Sight Distances required for Access onto National, Regional and Local Roads and for a design speed of 30kph a sightline of 35 metres is indicated.

It is also indicated that on narrow Local Roads with poor horizontal and vertical alignment and where the 80 km/h speed limit applies, the design speed applied for access visibility requirements should be the speed (km/h) that one can drive the road in a safe manner. This can be assessed as the 85th percentile speed drivers travel on the road. The visibility will then be assessed on the 85th percentile speed for that road.

5.1.11. The site is located within a Special Landscape Sensitivity in a Coastal Landscape Zone, with a landscape value of 3 but is not impacting upon any proscribed and protected views.

5.2. Galway County Transport and Planning Strategy 2022 – 2028.

5.2.1. The strategy arises from a policy objective of Galway County Council to support and facilitate the implementation of the Galway County Transport & Planning Strategy and Galway Transport Strategy across all modes of transport. The GCTPS proposes a range of measures, including transport infrastructure upgrades, support for service

enhancements, and supporting activities, which will collectively deliver enhancements and changes in travel behaviour within the County which are consistent with the policy objectives defined within Chapter 6 of the CDP. The strategy identifies an area defined as the Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan area and the appeal site is located within this area and reflects closely the characteristics of rural areas under strong urban pressure.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.3.1. The subject site is not located within a site designated as a Natura 2000 site or NHA/pNHA.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development is a Class to which Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, applies and therefore, the requirement for submission of an EIAR and carrying out of an EIA may be set aside.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellant grounds of appeal in summary refers to;

- The appellant refers to the nature of the change of use indicating it is a low intensity appointment only physiotherapy clinic operated by a single physiotherapist and functions strictly on an appointment only basis.
- One patient at a time with no overlapping appointments or walk ins.
- There are no additional staff and minimal deliveries.
- There is therefore a maximum of two vehicular movements per hour and no material intensification of traffic and significantly lower than a typical two adult household.
- There is no change to the existing access.

- In relation to ground number 2 which relates to traffic hazard there is no intensification of use and appointment per month ranged from an average of 13 monthly sessions in 2023 to 28 in 2025.
- In 2025 this reflected an average of 7 per week and some cycle and walk.
- 97% of the patients are from areas west of the city and this avoids travel to Galway city and adding to congestion.
- The clinic supports three local sports clubs and community groups, schools and clubs.
- The appointments are organised to avoid overlapping between patients and providing for confidentiality and given these constraints the maximum working limit of approximately 20 sessions.
- 25 metres sightline visibility was accepted for a neighbouring house and the current entrance meets and exceeds this standard.
- Policy objective NNR2 does not apply as the development does not create a new access or materially intensify traffic and traffic levels remain low, controlled and predictable.
- The development does not contravene CD 1, DM Standard 17 or NNR2 of the CDP.
- An engineering assessment certification in relation to the access achieving 25 metres sightlines which meets the accepted standard and that the development does not materially intensify traffic is also attached to the grounds of appeal.

7.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- 7.2.1. The planning authority has made no response in relation to the appeal submission.

8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. The main issues in this appeal relate to the stated reasons for which relate to the principle of the development in the context of the provisions of the current County

Development Plan and the issue of traffic hazard. Appropriate Assessment also requires to be considered. I am satisfied that no other substantive issues arise.

8.2. The reasons for refusal do specifically refer to in reason no 1 that the proposal is therefore considered to materially contravene Policy Objective CD 1 and DM Standard 17 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022–2028 having regard to in particular Policy Objective CD 1 (a), (d), (e) and (f).

8.3. Section 37 (2) (b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended provides for where a planning authority has decided to refuse permission on the grounds that a proposed development materially contravenes the development plan, the Board may only grant permission in accordance with paragraph (a) where it considers that—

(i) the proposed development is of strategic or national importance,

(ii) there are conflicting objectives in the development plan or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned, or

(iii) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to regional spatial and economic strategy for the area, guidelines under section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the government the Minister or any Minister of the Government, or

(iv) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan.

Policy Objective CD 1 – Rural Enterprises as stated in the reason for refusal states provides for consider and support the establishment of small scale rural orientated enterprises in unserviced rural areas outside of town or village settings which can be accommodated in existing farm buildings or can be established on a brownfield site, subject to satisfying the following criteria:

(a) Compatibility and general suitability to an unserviced rural area (primary consideration will be given to agriculture, renewable and marine resources, forestry, tourism, recreation or food production related enterprise activities and services);

(b) Scale of development (assimilate appropriately into a rural setting);

- (c) Nature of development (raw materials sourced locally);
- (d) Consideration of social and environmental impacts (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or rural amenity);
- (e) The enterprise must not constitute a road safety hazard or have a major adverse impact on the road network, road capacity and traffic levels;
- (f) Residential amenity (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity).

Section 15.3.4 Rural Enterprise DM Standard 17: indicates the Council will consider rural enterprises, and resource development and outlines criteria which largely reflect matters referred to in Policy Objective CD 1.

- 8.3.1. In relation to the policy the criteria as set out do not preclude consideration of development but set out matters to be considered in assessing a development. The policy and criteria is orientated to rural enterprises would not strictly be considered to refer to a home based activity as applied for. It is also noted that DM Standard 17 is referred to but Section 15.4 in relation to Development Management which refers to Economic Enterprise and Retail specifically refers to Home Based Economic Activities and that home based economic activity may be considered. The use must be ancillary in scale and nature to the residential unit. Potential impact on neighbouring residential amenity must be addressed and minimised. This provision would I consider permit development which would be considered to materially contravene the development plan. Notwithstanding the provisions as stated in Policy Objective CD 1 and DM Standard 17 there are conflicting objectives in the development plan which would not preclude the Commission from granting the development.

Having considered (i) to (iv) I do not consider that they preclude the Commission from granting the development as the proposed development is not of strategic or national importance, there are conflicting objectives in the development plan which could permit consideration of the development, national guidance does not apply and it would appear the development could be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted.

8.4. **The principle of the development**

- 8.4.1. The development as submitted is for the retention for change of use from part of an existing dwelling house to a physio room including all associated site works. The floor area of the retention is stated as 29.83m² within an existing dwelling with a stated area of 147.5m². The development for retention comprises a reception area and a physio room with a toilet off the physio room located adjoining the southern gable of the dwelling. The existing dwelling has the benefit of a planning permission.
- 8.4.2. The first reason for refusal largely is in relation to the principle of the development having regard to the provisions as stated in the current CDP. The development is located in the open countryside and not within an established settlement. The plan in section 4.13 which relates to commercial developments in rural areas recognises that rural businesses and enterprises are an important source of local employment in the County and cites examples of rural businesses that exist throughout the county including agricultural, equine, engineering/manufacturing, recreational, tourism, energy/renewable energy, and rural resource-based enterprises.
- 8.4.3. There is no specific policy guidance in the development plan relating to a home based activity which would a more appropriate description of the use/development under consideration. It is also indicated that in the first instance, new employment related developments are directed to settlements where services are available, and lands have been identified for employment uses. It is also recognised that there are instances where a development can be more readily accommodated or is more appropriate to a rural area. This can be due to a locational specific, or resourced based development, or a development of regional or national importance.
- 8.4.4. In relation to the current development, it would not be readily identified as a rural or rural resource-based enterprise. It would be an enterprise more readily considered as a service more appropriately located within a settlement and there are settlements in the area such as Barna and Spiddal which would be considered a more appropriate location.
- 8.4.5. The development plan does set out criteria in Policy Objective CD 1 to consider and support the establishment of small scale rural orientated enterprises in unserviced rural areas outside of town or village settings which can be accommodated in existing farm buildings or can be established on a brownfield site. It is noted that the appeal site is not an existing farm building or brownfield site.

8.4.6. Specifically in relation to the criteria outlined;

(a) Compatibility and general suitability to an unserviced rural area (primary consideration will be given to agriculture, renewable and marine resources, forestry, tourism, recreation or food production related enterprise activities and services).

The development would not meet this criterium.

(b) Scale of development (assimilate appropriately into a rural setting);

The development is small in scale and does not provide for an increased floor area of an existing building.

(c) Nature of development (raw materials sourced locally)

The development is not reliant on raw materials sourced locally.

(d) Consideration of social and environmental impacts (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on the environment or rural amenity).

The development does provide a social service which is medically related and would not impact on the environment given the likely emissions arising. Given its location and distance to other properties immediately in the vicinity and that the building is currently in situ and not altered or proposed to be extended issues in relation to rural amenity do not I consider arise.

(e) The enterprise must not constitute a road safety hazard or have a major adverse impact on the road network, road capacity and traffic levels.

This issue arises more specifically in the second reason for refusal and will be considered in that context.

(f) Residential amenity (enterprise must not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity).

In relation to this criterium the development would not I consider have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity for the reasons outlined in (c).

8.4.7. In the grounds of appeal, the appellant contends that the clinic supports three local sports clubs and community groups, schools and clubs. The appointments are organised to avoid overlapping between patients and providing for confidentiality and given these constraints the maximum working limit of approximately 20 sessions and

the clientele would be largely locally based and avoids unnecessary journeys to Calway City.

The nature of providing a medical related service is not I consider disputed and it may be primarily locally based in relation to clients who would attend but not necessarily exclusively local as clients travelling from Moycullen are referred to in the grounds of appeal.

- 8.4.8. In relation to an overall assessment and considering the principle of development the overriding presumption as stated in the CDP is that services of the nature proposed to be retained are more appropriately located in settlements and this, I consider is reasonable. The use proposed to be retained has not, I consider, established why an exception is warranted in a rural area and no justification on why it is not within a settlement centre is I consider set out.

In relation to DM Standard 17 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022–2028 also stated in reason no. 1 this largely relates to traffic matters and will be considered in an assessment of traffic.

- 8.4.9. The second reason for refusal indicated that the Planning Authority consider that proposed development would result in an intensification of use of an existing dwelling access whilst being at variance to Policy Objective NNR2: Safeguard Regional and Local Roads of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and 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.

The site fronts onto a minor local road which to the south has a junction with the R336 Galway to Spiddal regional route. The road is relatively narrow and of a poor alignment but it would be lightly trafficked given the scale of development it serves and there are passing points on the road for vehicles. The existing access points provides for a minimum of 25 metres in both directions which would be lower than the standard as outlined in DM Standard 28 of the CDP which relates to Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads and table 15.3 outlines sight distances required for Access onto National, Regional and Local Roads and for a design speed of 30kph a sightline of 35 metres is indicated.

It is however also indicated that on narrow Local Roads with poor horizontal and vertical alignment and where the 80 km/h speed limit applies, the design speed applied for access visibility requirements should be the speed (km/h) that one can drive the road in a safe manner. This can be assessed as the 85th percentile speed drivers travel on the road. The visibility will then be assessed on the 85th percentile speed for that road. In relation to the local road, it would be a road where traffic would travel at a low speed and traffic volumes would be low.

The issue to consider is whether in the context of prevailing road conditions the scale of additional traffic movements would be of a scale to be considered significant and as a consequence that the development would interfere with the safety and free flow of traffic on the public road and would consequently endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard, obstruction of road users, or otherwise as stated in the reason for refusal.

The appellant has contended in the grounds of appeal that the use is a low intensity appointment only physiotherapy clinic operated by a single physiotherapist and functions strictly on an appointment only basis, operates on a schedule of on patient at a time with no overlapping appointments or walk ins; that there are no additional staff and minimal deliveries and therefore there is a maximum of two vehicular movements per hour and no material intensification of traffic and significantly lower than a typical two adult household and it is also indicated that there is no change to the existing access.

Specifically in relation to actual increased level of traffic movements, it is contended that there is no intensification of use and appointment per month ranged from an average of 13 monthly sessions in 2023 to 28 in 2025 and in 2025 this reflected an average of 7 per week and some cycle and walk with 97% of the patients are from areas west of the city and this avoids travel to Galway city and adding to congestion. The appointments are organised to avoid overlapping between patients and providing for confidentiality and given these constraints the maximum working limit of approximately 20 sessions.

An engineering assessment certification is also submitted in relation to the access achieving 25 metres sightlines which meets the accepted standard and that the development does not materially intensify traffic is also attached to the grounds of

appeal. The basis of meeting the accepted standard is stated that Galway County Council have accepted 25 metres sightlines on this road and is not related to any specific survey data.

It would be important initially to state that any increase in traffic would represent a level of intensification however given the indicated additional levels I do not consider that they are significant and resulting in peak flows at certain periods of the day to impact on the carrying capacity of the road network. The issue is whether the road network serving the appeal site can accommodate the increased volume in a manner that would not give rise to a traffic hazard or adversely impact on the carrying capacity of the road network. As stated, the volume of traffic generated is low and managed over the day with no peak flow generation. The site is relatively close to the junction with the regional road approximately 150 metres distant and there are passing points which would eliminate potential interference with the free flow of traffic movements and there is also a satisfactory junction arrangement between the local road and the regional road.

In the context of the existing road condition and alignment, existing and anticipated traffic generation arising from the development and anticipated travel speed of vehicles I consider that the existing access arrangements are satisfactory to accommodate the additional traffic arising from the development and the road network can also accommodate traffic volumes arising from the development and that a traffic hazard does not arise.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposal for the retention for change of use from part of an existing dwelling house to a physio room including all associated site works.
- 9.2. The development comprises in effect a relatively minor development as outlined in section 2 in the Inspectors report. Having regard to the location, nature and scale of the proposed development confined within an established residential property, and the absence of connectivity to European sites it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on these European sites.

10.0 Water Framework

10.1. The subject site is not located immediate to a waterbody The development comprises no additional construction works as referred to in section 2 of this report. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

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

- Nature of works regarding the nature and scale of the development.
- The context of the surrounding area.
- Location and distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections.

Conclusion

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

11.1. I recommend that permission be refused.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the nature of the development, the existing residential use on the site; the design, nature and scale of the proposed development and the pattern and character of development in the vicinity; the planning history of the site and to the

provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and in particular Section 4.13 to Commercial Developments in Rural Areas and Policy Objective CD 1 – Rural Enterprises the provisions of which are considered to be reasonable, it is considered that having regard to the stated provisions in particular Policy Objective CD 1 (a) and (c), it is considered that the development as proposed would more appropriately located within an existing settlement than in the open countryside and would therefore 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

Derek Daly
Planning Inspector

26th May 2026

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL 500877-GY-26
Proposed Development Summary	The retention for change of use from part of an existing dwelling house to a physio room including all associated site works.
Development Address	Coisméig Mór, Furbo, County Galway.
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input type="checkbox"/> X No , it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
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"/> , it is a Class specified in Part 1.	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X No ,	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input 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. No Screening required.	
No , the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
No , the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) Yes	

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)
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Derek Daly Date: 26th May 2026