



Development

Extension to hotel, 72 no. bedrooms, alterations and change of use of existing restaurant premises into hotel goods receiving area and all associated site works. The planning application is supported by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS).

Location

The Wyatt Hotel, The Octagon, Westport, County Mayo.

Planning Authority

Mayo County Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560720.

Applicant(s)

The Wyatt Hotel Unlimited.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission + Conditions.

Type of Appeal

Third Party Normal Planning Appeal.

Appellant(s)

Kieran Ryan.

Observer(s)

None.

Date of Site Inspection

9th June 2026.

Inspector

C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject town centre site, of area 0.515ha., consists of the two to three storey Octagon Hotel, separate commercial building and three terraced houses, Leisure Centre Car Park and public park to the rear. The hotel building includes a modern extension to its rear. The site slopes downhill from the front to the rear and the rear area also slopes downhill towards the north side. The adjacent park to the rear slopes downhill and is at a lower level.
- 1.2. The site, at its Church Street end, is adjacent to the gated entrance to the grounds of Westport House, a protected structure. The front of the site is adjacent to the Wyatt Theatre and is opposite the Glendinning monument, both protected structures. The site is within Westport Architectural Conservation Area.
- 1.3. The southern rear site area fronts Church Street and the northern rear side of the site is adjacent to the Leisure Centre car park which is adjacent to car parks associated with other buildings which leads out to James Street to the north-east.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:
 - Construction of a three storey rear and side extension over a semi-basement car park with a total gross floor area of 5,333sqm.
 - The extension will comprise 72 no. bedrooms including the alteration of some existing bedrooms.
 - 88 no. new basement parking spaces
 - 20 no. new public surface car park spaces off Church Street.
 - ESB sub-station, plant rooms, staff quarters, ancillary accommodation and ancillary areas.
 - Relocation of the good delivery set-down area from Church Street to Lower Peter Street.
 - Change of use of existing 135sqm restaurant into hotel goods receiving area.

- Converting ground floor six bedrooms to increase the size of the existing dining area.
- Alterations to lower ground floor car park including demolition of three existing staff habitable terraced dwelling houses.
- Construction of new public path from Church Street to Leisure Centre Car Park.
- Associated site works including boundary treatments and external lighting.
- The application is accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Mayo County Council initially decided to request further information in relation to (1) a car parking audit in relation to the existing and proposed development and potential shortfall of spaces, (2) a revised site layout plan showing internal crossings per DMURS, (3) revised proposals for a 3m wide public footpath, (4) plot ratio and site coverage calculations and (5) a Construction Management Plan.

3.1.2. Following F.I., the P.A. decided to grant permission subject to 13 no. conditions.

Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 2 requires the submission of detailed external finishes.
- Condition no. 3 requires the mitigation measures outlined in Section 6.2 of the NIS to be implemented.
- Condition no. 5 requires parking for the development to fully comply with Section 7.12 of Volume 2 of the CDP.
- Condition no. 7 requires a Quality Audit / Road Safety Audit type review at each work stage in relation to vulnerable road users with all recommendations required to be implemented.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. The initial Planner's Report noted the site zoning for 'Town Centre Inner (TCI) development and considered the development to be acceptable in principle. In

relation to car parking it noted it was not clear what the car parking requirement is for the existing and proposed development. It noted that a total of 108 no. space were proposed with 20 to be provided for public use to offset 7 existing spaces in the Leisure Centre car park.

- 3.2.2. It noted that pre-application discussions took place with the Council architect and noted the report on file recommending a grant in relation to the design. It recommended that all final material finishes be agreed by way of condition.
- 3.2.3. It noted a requirement to comply with policy on plot ratio and site coverage. The report noted the submission of the NIS with potential effects on the Clew Bay Complex SAC discussed and mitigation measures proposed. The report finished by recommending that F.I. be requested in relation to the items mentioned in Section 3.1 above.
- 3.2.4. The second Planner's Report noted that the response stated that 99 spaces are required and that 88 spaces are proposed excluding the 20 public spaces and 19 existing spaces. It considered that adequate car parking was provided based on the submission.
- 3.2.5. In relation to internal footpaths, it noted the revised site layout plan showing the required details. It noted that the plot ratio of 1.48 and site coverage of 51.3% complied with the CDP. It considered the submitted CMP acceptable.
- 3.2.6. In relation to the third party concerns, it considered these concerns to have been addressed. It noted that the Road Design section had no objection in relation to traffic. In relation to the walkway, it noted that the Active Travel section requested the 3m wide pathway. It considered the proposed development to be supported by a number of policies including in relation to the tourism industry and town centre vitality. It concluded by recommending that permission be granted subject to 13 no. conditions.
- 3.2.7. An Appropriate Assessment Report was included after the recommendation to grant permission. It noted that at construction stage there was the potential for pollutants to reach the receiving environment. It noted that best practice mitigation measures are included in Section 6.2 of the NIS. It therefore considered that the proposed development would not individually or in-combination give rise to adverse affects on

the integrity of European sites provided that the mitigation measures contained in the NIS are implemented.

3.2.8. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer: No issues noted.
- Environment – Flood Risk:
- Road Design: F.I. requested in relation to a car parking spaces audit and failure of site layout to show internal footpaths and crossings. Following F.I.: no objection subject to conditions.
- Architects Section: Recommends approval of the design with condition requiring final approval of external finishes.
- Architectural Conservation Office: No response received.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- Transport Infrastructure Ireland: No objection subject to standard condition.
- Development Applications Unit: No response received.
- An Taisce: No response received.
- The Heritage Council: No response received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

One third party observation was received which can be summarised as follows:

- The Council previously sold the land to the developer which represents a conflict of interest for the subject application.
- Westport has an excess concentration of hospitality businesses.
- The development would fail to contribute to the street in terms of vitality and activity.
- Three dwellings would be lost in a housing crisis.
- Failure to align with the greenway outlined in the LAP.
- The traffic assessment is inadequate.
- The loading bay on Peter Street would obstruct motorists.

4.0 Planning History

Subject Site

19/99: Permission granted by the P.A. for alterations and additions to existing hotel including modifications and retention of alterations to development under construction (p17/583 & p18/194 refers) including, alterations to exterior elevations, alterations to lower ground floor area including omission of "cobblers" basement, addition of 39sqm extension to rear of foyer area at ground floor, addition of 34sqm extension to rear of first floor over cobblers bar and re-instatement of rear walls and roof over "cobblers" bar.

18/194: Permission granted by the P.A. for demolitions, alterations, and extension to hotel comprising ground floor extension to "cobbler's bar" with bar/dining area and kitchen, basement extension with stores, first floor extension with 5 no. bedrooms including roof modification, all ancillary accommodation and associated works. retention of existing external smoking area of "cobblers bar.

17/583: Permission granted by the P.A. for a three storey over car park 744 sqm extension to the rear of the existing hotel comprising 21 no. bedrooms and 9 no. car park spaces ancillary accommodation and works.

14/263: Permission granted by the P.A. for alterations and additions to existing hotel building to include construction of link corridor to new ground floor bedrooms within existing hotel, removal of existing door recess on church lane, construction of bedroom window opening and fire escape door, extension of existing courtyard balcony, retention of bar stores, bar extension, bar canopy, change of use from shop to bar, modifications to elevations and signage.

Sites in the Vicinity

21/1170: Permission granted by the P.A. for building a new valet car park solution for the Wyatt Hotel to the rear of the existing Supervalu with a new raised deck car park containing 64 new car park spaces with associated car lifts and stairs. Not implemented to date. Grant date: 4th January 2022.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (the CDP)

Chapter 2 – Core and Settlement Strategy

Westport is part of a growth cluster with Castlebar. The town is designated as a key town and strategic growth town in the settlement hierarchy.

SO 3 Employment and Investment *To support employment, encourage enterprise, maximise investment and create an environment that will establish Mayo as a premier investment location, capitalising on the county's existing and emerging key economic drivers, such as the Coastal Corridor and Marine Environment, the Atlantic Economic Corridor, Ireland West Airport Knock (IWAK), the IWAK Strategic Development Zone and the Economic Growth Clusters of Ballina/North Mayo, Castlebar-Westport, Ballinrobe, Ballyhaunis and Claremorris, and Ballina-Killala.*

Chapter 3 – Housing

Objective TVHO 12 *To review the car parking standards (Table 7 of Section 7.12.1 Vol. II) over the lifetime of the plan to include maximum parking standards. In the interim period, a reduction of parking standard requirements will be considered for urban infill and brownfield locations, subject to the individual merits of each development proposals, with respect to performance-based criteria, in accordance with the provisions of NPO 13.*

Chapter 5 – Tourism and Recreation

Section 5.4.2 outlines general tourism policies.

TRP 22 – *To support the implementation of priority infrastructural developments and tourism facilities identified by the Tourism Section of Mayo County Council, including the development of new tourist facilities or upgrading/extension of existing tourist facilities at tourist sites within the county, within proper planning and sustainable development principles.*

TRP 23 – *To support and promote sustainable tourism, accessible to all throughout County Mayo, and to work in partnership with tourism organisations and adjoining local authorities, where necessary, in securing the development of tourism*

enterprises and infrastructure, subject to suitable locations, where it can be demonstrated that the development will not have significant adverse effects on the environment, including the integrity of the Natura 200 network, residential amenity or visual amenity.

Chapter 9 – Built Environment

Policy BEP 6 – To encourage the conservation of Protected Structures, and where appropriate, the adaptive re-use of existing buildings and sites in a manner compatible with their character and significance.

Policy BEO 10 To protect the setting of protected structures and seek to prevent the demolition or inappropriate alteration of Protected Structures, which would adversely impact on the character and special interest of the structure, where appropriate.

Policy BEP 16 To promote and support the re-use and re-purposing of extant building stock, in the first instance, over demolition and rebuilding building, where practical, with reference to the loss of our historic building stock, sense of place and the environmental cost.

Volume 2

Section 5.4 Table 3 sets out maximum plot ratio which shall generally be as set out: for commercial use, inside town centre area, the maximum plot ratio is 1.5.

Section 5.5 Site Coverage

...Site Coverage shall not normally exceed 60%. Exceptions may be allowed in limited circumstances, when it can be justified that a higher percentage is required for urban regeneration or an innovative design and layout is proposed. The developer shall include a site coverage calculation as part of the planning application.

Section 7.12 Car parking

Section 7.5 A Road Safety Audit (RSA) shall be carried out for all significant developments proposed and submitted as part of the planning application. A 'significant development' includes development(s) which generate 40+ Traffic Movements per day or results in a modification to the road layout.

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) shall be conducted in respect of proposed significant developments whereby traffic generated by the development exceeds 10% of the existing traffic level on the road, or 5% where the road is already congested.

Significant development proposals shall also be accompanied by a Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA). Each RSA, TIA and TTA shall be carried out in accordance with Transport Infrastructure Ireland's requirements.

Table 7 sets out car parking standards. *All new development proposals will normally be required to meet the minimum Parking Standards set out below.*

For hotels, the requirement is one space per bedroom plus one space per employee/shift...

Electronic Vehicle Charging points A minimum of 10% of the proposed car parking spaces required for the category of development listed in car parking standards below shall be provided with electrical connection points, to allow for functional electric vehicle charging. The remaining car parking spaces shall be fitted with ducting for electrical connection points to allow for the future fit out of charging points at up to 20% of car parking spaces.

Table 8 sets out Disabled Parking Standards which for 76 to 100 spaces is 5 spaces, over 100 is 3 spaces per additional 100.

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

Per LAP Map 1 the site zoning is for 'Town Centre Inner (TCI) development which under objective LUZ 1 is "To maintain and enhance the vitality, viability and environment of the town centre and provide for appropriate town centre uses". Hotel use is permitted in principle in the inner area and licensed premises and restaurant use are permitted in principle.

Per Lap Map 3, there are no protected structures on the site although Westport House demesne is at the end of Church Street and Wyatt Theatre (a protected structure) and the Glendinning Monument are located a short distance away from the front of the building at The Octagon. The site is within Westport ACA.

Section 2.4 (Strategic Key Priorities) includes the following part, *Promotion and continued sustainable development and enhancement of Westport as a major tourism centre in the West of Ireland, building on its reputation as one of Ireland's premier visitor destinations along the Wild Atlantic Way, as a Heritage Town and gateway to areas of outstanding natural and built heritage.*

Section 2.5 (Strategic Goals) includes the following,

....Town Centre Regeneration/Consolidation: To develop a robust and design-led urban regeneration and development strategy; to maximise the strengths of the town; and to promote sustainable movement. To integrate new and regenerated areas within the historic core in a contemporary manner that complements the existing urban structure and heritage of the town. To create an integrated and commercially robust, liveable and sustainable town. To ensure that best practice urban design principles are applied to all new development, based on the principle that well-planned and integrated development enhances the sustainability, attractiveness and liveability of an area....

Economic Development and Employment: To support and enhance the sustainable economic growth of Westport, consistent with its role as settlement with strategic development potential of a regional scale, through the provision of designated areas for high quality employment, through the expansion and protection and enhancement of its tourism product and through the further development and expansion of its role as a thriving retail destination....

Policy TCP 1 Ensure the vitality and viability of the town centre is maintained and to strengthen its function by facilitating the development of residential, retail, community and tourism services, subject to compliance with the policies and development management standards of the County Development Plan.

Policy TCP 3 Protect the visual character, built and cultural heritage, ambience, and vitality of the traditional heart of the town centre in order to meet the retailing and service needs of the area, in addition to offering a pleasant and attractive environment for shopping, business, tourism, recreation and living.

Policy TCP 5 Support the development of the further public realm projects in Westport that will enhance the aesthetics of the town's built and natural character and improve the overall ambience and visitor experience of the town.

5.1 Strategic Aims *To support and enhance the sustainable economic growth of Westport, consistent with its role as a Strategic Growth Town through the provision of designated areas for high quality employment, through the expansion and protection of its tourism product and through the enhancement and expansion of its role as a manufacturing hub and as a thriving retail destination.*

Section 5.7 deals with tourism which is supported in the town.

Section 8.6 Architectural Conservation Area

The [Westport] ACA associated with this LAP is in essence the 18th century planned urban core of Westport. Most of the buildings within the ACA are vernacular two and three story, two-bay, slated structures, predominantly in the Georgian style. Their facades present a traditional vertical fenestration pattern to the streetscape, often complimented by sliding sash painted timber windows, and associated limestone cills...

5.3. Relevant National Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities, Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, (2024).

Climate Action Plan 2025 and Climate Action Plan 2024, Government of Ireland.

Design Manual for Urban Streets, 2019, Department of Transport.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

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

- c.1.1km east of Clew Bay Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 001482).
- c.2.5km south-east of Coolbarreen Lough PNHA (site code 000481).
- c.3.9km north-east of Knappagh Woods PNHA (site code 001520).
- c.4.4km north-east of Brackloon Woods SAC and PNHA (site code 000471).
- c.4.5km north-west of Kinlooney Lough PNHA (site code 001518).
- c.5.3km north-east of Lough Greney Bog NHA (site code 002455).
- c.5.7km north-east of Croagh Patrick PNHA (site code 000483).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal by Kieran Ryan can be summarised as follows:

- The context for the appeal is the appellant's belief that the Council has a conflict of interest in that he states it sold land for this development, the developer will be paying the Council over €1m for the land, a contribution for co-development of the surrounding area and development contributions.
- The new 20 public car parking spaces off Church Street will be for public parking from which the Council can generate revenue.
- The TTA was conducted in April 2025 around 6 months prior to the sale of the public land to the hotel.
- A review by ACP would strengthen public confidence in the planning process.

Road Safety

- The new loading bay at Peter Street (N59) will be unsafe as highlighted in the Road Safety Audit. Larger vehicles parking may reduce the carriageway width leading to sideswipe collisions and it would obscure driver views of the pedestrian crossing at the Octagon.
- The applicant's acceptance of the RSA recommendations is not catered for in the conditions of the planning decision. The two relevant recommendations contradict each other and there is no means to widen the carriageway without the loss of existing parking spaces or major developments.
- The impact on the car parking and the cost of widening the carriageway have not been considered.
- There has been no examination of the roadside changes by TII.
- If the loading bay is rejected then the viability of the new goods entrance on Peter Street should also be re-examined.
- The TTA was conducted in April outside of the tourist high season which is inadequate and it fails to recognise the potential for increased congestion at Peter Street.

- The predicted traffic movements are predicated on an extremely low baseline and the new parking will attract more vehicles.
- Congestion will be created from vehicles stuck behind right-turning vehicles from Peter Street into Church Street.
- The traffic flow diagrams do not show the flow through the leisure centre car park and it excludes the entrance to the new car park.
- The volume of spaces the Leisure Centre car park exit would be doubling from the current 90 spaces.
- The TTA fails to assess the impact of traffic exiting the Wyatt Hotel car park via the Leisure Centre car park on to the N59 at James Street and a DMURS assessment of the junction is required as well as a TII assessment of the national road.
- The TTA is valid and the planning application is therefore not valid.
- A safety audit of all the streets affected is required.
- The footpath on James Street should be continuous and the hierarchy of priority should be clear.
- There are risks with the proposed one-way system including in relation to vehicles driving against the flow of traffic.
- Failure to assess the road safety risks for the exit from the Leisure Centre car park to James Street and the potential to turn right and go the wrong up the one-way street.

Sustainable and Balanced Development

- The proposed development will result in the overdevelopment of hospitality in Westport in a housing crisis.
- There is a severe shortage/absence of accommodation to rent in the town.
- Up to one third of residential properties have become short-term lets per the ESRI, April 2025.
- Without an accurate count of hospitality beds in the town, it cannot be determined what effect the proposed addition to this will have.

- The three houses to be demolished will be lost as staff accommodation.

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

The applicant's response to the third party appeal can be summarised as follows:

- In relation to the roads issues, the response on behalf of the applicant was prepared by NRB Consulting Engineers.
- It is facile to suggest that the proposed loading bay would constitute an unacceptable traffic safety risk and it represents the conversion of parking spaces to a loading bay, simply signed and marked as such.
- The proposed loading bay is preferable to the existing arrangements on Church Street where there is no turning space available.
- There is no evidence of a road safety risk at the junction of the Leisure Centre car park exit and the N59.
- The road safety and appropriateness of the design has been subject to a Road Safety Audit by qualified experts and was approved by qualified experts of the Council.
- A Stage 2 (detailed design) and stage 3 (works completion, prior to opening) RSA will be undertaken per the design obligations.
- The TTA has been updated to redistribute the tiny levels of traffic generated by the extension with the existing traffic linked through the Leisure Centre and found that the impacts on the town centre junctions will be negligible.
- The traffic generated are well below the Development Plan threshold at which a TIA is required.
- There is strong LAP policy support for tourism development in the town such as under Sections 2.4, 2.5 and 5.1 in relation to strategic priorities.
- The proposed development will promote the sustainable development of the town as a tourist centre, contribute to urban regeneration and economic growth and provide increased hospitality employment.
- It will deliver high quality tourist accommodation in the town and will provide a high quality and sustainable alternative to short term letting.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

No response.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Tourism Impact
- Design
- Road Safety
- Traffic and Transport
- Other Matters

7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1. I note the site zoning is for 'Town Centre Inner' (TCI) development which under objective LUZ 1 is "*To maintain and enhance the vitality, viability and environment of the town centre and provide for appropriate town centre uses*". Hotel use is permitted in principle in the inner area, and licensed premises and restaurant use are permitted in principle.

7.2.2. In use terms, noting the proposed development is mainly for a hotel extension with an extended dining area, I consider the proposed hotel and restaurant type uses to be acceptable in principle subject to the below assessment in relation to the vitality, viability and environment of the town centre.

7.3. Tourism Impact

7.3.1. I note that the appeal has raised concerns regarding the sustainability of the development particularly in the context of a housing crisis and the number of existing hotels and other forms of tourist accommodation in the town, including short-term

lets. The appeal cites the ESRI in noting that up to one third of residential properties in the town have become short-term lets and that housing availability is often non-existent for existing residents and workers.

7.3.2. I note the ESRI report cited confirms that there is “*one Airbnb listing for every three private rental properties in Westport*” (ESRI, April 2025, Profiling short-term let usage across Ireland). I note that Westport is designated as a rent pressure zone. I note there is a lack of information on the file in relation to the current tourist accommodation offerings in the town. Nevertheless, I note that the CDP process requires the zoning of sufficient land for residential development and I note a number of sites in Westport that are zoned for residential development are available. In this context, if there is an excessive amount of short-term lets in the town, I am satisfied that the residential zonings and policies of the CDP which encourage compact residential development are sufficient to allow this potential issue to be addressed in planning terms.

7.3.3. In terms of the impact on the vitality, viability and environment of the town centre, I consider that a hotel extension of 72 no. bedrooms would enhance street level activity in the town centre and would provide additional custom to the town and surrounding area in a reasonably sustainable manner. Future occupants would have access on foot to the town centre and its facilities and offerings such that I consider the proposed development would enhance the vitality, viability and environment of the town centre in accordance with CDP policy which encourages tourism.

7.4. Design

Demolition

7.4.1. I note that the three dwellings to be demolished of 253sqm would consist of a modest pitched roof terrace lower in scale to the adjacent existing hotel terrace. I note it is not a protected structure and is of no particular architectural merit. I note the modest area of demolition proposed. I consider that the new structures proposed at this part of Church Street would enhance the street and would better integrate with the existing hotel building due to the greater height and the alignment of the levels.

7.4.2. In this way and noting its lack of historic interest I consider there would be no undue impact on the Westport ACA from the proposed demolition. I consider this, and the economic and social benefits of the hotel extension, as supported by CDP and LAP

policy, would outweigh any losses associated with the embodied carbon of the existing structures proposed for demolition.

Extension Design

- 7.4.3. I note that the proposed hotel extension would extend to the rear to the north-west and to the rear/side to the north-east. This would include 20 no. surface car parking spaces directly to the rear of the building and a vehicular route through the basement car park levels to the adjacent leisure centre car park to the north-east. The rear element would slope uphill towards the north away from Church Street. It would include two basement level car parks. To the rear of the surface car park, there would be a 3m wide public path adjacent to the open space to the north-west and this would link with the leisure centre.
- 7.4.4. I note that the proposed new rear north-west facing façade would be four storeys towards the Church Street end and three storeys towards the north-east end of the site. It would be vertically broken down into distinct elements through the use of some projecting elements, windows with strong vertical emphasis, the retention of the existing rear extension element, and with different external materials. In my opinion this would make for a visual interesting rear façade which would be well broken up to avoid excessive massing.
- 7.4.5. I consider that the window designs would provide appropriate vertical emphasis in the facades and that the window designs would aid in providing a coherent rear façade that would appropriately enclose the spaces to the rear and rear/side. I note that good passive surveillance would be provided to the rear and rear sides of the extension. I note that the basement car park area rear façade would include two horizontal windows, one long one at first floor level with a stone façade.
- 7.4.6. I note that the new Church Street elevations would appear as modern and distinct extensions of the existing terrace by virtue of the flat roofs and use of render wall finishes above ground floor which would visually distinguish from the existing adjacent stone finishes. I note that the zinc cladding around the corner element at second floor level would appropriately mark the corner. I consider that the design would integrate with the existing terrace along Church Street and would step up modestly from it.

- 7.4.7. I consider that this high-quality design treatment and the three to four storey equivalent facades above it would integrate with the existing hotel building and the site and surroundings given the heights and scale. In my opinion the proposed scale of the rear extension would be appropriate for the setting of the adjacent street and car park and facing towards the public park area.
- 7.4.8. I note that the rear element would be well separated from the gates of Westport House and Demesne to the north-west at the end of the street such that I have no significant concerns in relation to impacts on the protected structure and its curtilage. I note that the height of the rear and side extensions would not rise above the height of the front elements when viewed from the Octagon. When viewed from the south-east /front of the hotel, I do not consider that the extensions would have a significant impact on the hotel building or the buildings in the vicinity including the adjacent protected structure of the Wyatt Theatre or on Westport ACA.
- 7.4.9. I note the design when viewed from the north-east side would step up in height from two storeys to four storeys and that there would be some passive surveillance from the above first floor level and from the surface level car park north-east end which would overlook the adjacent Leisure Centre car park. I consider that this design, in this context and that of the park, would integrate with the site and surroundings to a reasonable extent and is acceptable. I note the County architect found the development acceptable. Similar to his recommendation, should permission be granted, I recommend a standard condition in relation to the agreement of the detailed external finishes.
- 7.4.10. I note that the new extension would comprise 72 no. bedrooms including the alteration of some existing bedrooms and the additional 183sqm area of dining room. I note the standard layout of the bedrooms with en-suite facilities such that I have no significant concerns in relation to the quality of the hotel accommodation proposed.
- 7.4.11. I note that following F.I. the Planner's Report noted that the plot ratio would be 1.48 and site coverage would be 51.3%. I note these would be below the maximums provided for in the CDP of 1.5 and 60% respectively such that I have no significant concerns in this regard. I also note no significant overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impacts in relation to surrounding properties. I also note no significant ecological impacts given the largely brownfield nature of the site in the town centre.

7.5. Road Safety

- 7.5.1. I note that the appellant has raised concerns regarding the safety of the loading bay on the N59 at Peter Street. I note that this loading bay would replace the existing on-street paid parking at this location and would be adjacent to a new goods-in area of the hotel. I note that the N59 at this location is within the town centre where the speed limit is 50kph and where DMURS standards apply and not TII standards.
- 7.5.2. I note that the Traffic and Transport Assessment submitted with the application noted that the four-way junction south of the proposed loading bay “*appears to operate satisfactorily given the urban town centre location*”. I note that the TTA conducted traffic surveys of the junctions in the vicinity including the junctions to the north and south of the loading bay. It noted that the increase in trips that would result over the existing moderate traffic levels would be less than the 5% threshold for a TIA and would not result in any noticeable increase in traffic levels.
- 7.5.3. On the date of my site visit on the afternoon of 9th June, I observed slow moving traffic passing the proposed loading bay area on both sides of the road. There were parked cars in the loading bay position and I observed no significant disruptions in this regard or significant restrictions in relation to vehicular movements or sightlines. I note this in the context of the road layout in the vicinity whereby the parking bays and junctions in close proximity result in driver caution and slow vehicle speeds which is consistent with DMURS advice.
- 7.5.4. I note the appeal response by NRB Consulting Engineers which states that the conversion of car parking spaces to loading bays by bye-law with simple signing and marking is a standard treatment for loading bays. I note that the Council engineers did not raise any significant issues in relation to same. I note the auto-tracking diagrams submitted show a rigid truck arriving and departing the loading bay. I note that this and the Stage 1 RSA in the TTA suggest that larger vehicles using the loading bay could reduce the carriageway width so that two vehicles cannot pass which could lead to side-swipe collisions. The RSA recommended that adequate carriageway width be made available for vehicles to pass.
- 7.5.5. The RSA also noted a problem at the proposed loading bay whereby a large high sided vehicle may obscure a driver’s view of crossing pedestrians at the pedestrian crossing to the north which could lead to collisions between vehicles and

pedestrians. It recommended a physical restriction so that such vehicle do not park too close the pedestrian crossing.

- 7.5.6. Based on the current design and road layout, I do not concur with the appeal response that the conversion of the existing on-street parking to a loading bay would not result in significant traffic safety issues. I note however that the road width is such that the Council would have the option of converting the on-street parking opposite to a layout with parking parallel to the street which would widen the carriageway. In my opinion this matter can be dealt with via a condition requiring a stage 2 (detailed design phase) and stage 3 (post implementation phase) road safety audit condition and a standard loading bay condition which would effectively require this matter be addressed to ensure adequate road safety measures are employed.
- 7.5.7. I note the appellant has suggested there was a failure to assess the road safety risks at the Leisure Centre car park exit to James Street including in relation to inadequate visibility and the risk of exiting cars turning the wrong way up James Street, a one-way street. On my site visit I viewed the leisure centre car park and its junction with James Street as well as the surrounding streets.
- 7.5.8. I note the existing junction with James Street where the Leisure Centre car park exit meets it is operational with adequate sightlines in the town centre, appropriate signage and road markings and on my site visit I observed no significant traffic issues in relation to operational or potential safety issues. I note that a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was conducted which noted no significant issues. I note that the Council Engineer did not highlight any significant issues in this regard. Noting this and the long-established traffic characteristics in the town centre location where traffic speeds are generally low, particularly at turning points / junctions such as the junction with James Street, I do not consider that any significant traffic safety issue would arise.
- 7.5.9. Having observed the junction with James Street and the associated road layout, I do not consider there to be a risk that a driver exiting at this junction would turn left and drive the wrong way up James Street. In relation to traffic traversing through the Leisure Centre car park, I note the car park layout where vehicle speeds are low and the narrow carriageways which calm the traffic such that I have no traffic safety concerns from the modest increase in traffic that would result in this area.

7.5.10. I note that should permission be granted, the other road safety issues addressed in the TTA, RSA and addressed at F.I. stage can be catered for by standard conditions similar to those adopted by the P.A. in its decision to grant permission. I am therefore satisfied that no significant road safety issues arise from the proposed development.

7.6. Traffic and Transport

- 7.6.1. I note that the appellant has raised concerns in relation to traffic impact from traffic exiting the hotel car park through the leisure centre car park and onto the junction with James Street. I note that the appeal response by NRB Consulting Engineers includes additional junction modelling at the N59 junctions to the south and north of the Octagon and deals with the traffic that would come into and out of the new car parks. It states that this involves redistributing the traffic generated by the proposed development with the exiting traffic linked through the Leisure Centre car park.
- 7.6.2. I concur with the appellant response that the results of the updated traffic assessment show negligible changes in traffic conditions at the relevant junctions and in the town centre. For example, it finds that there would be a 1.4% increase in traffic levels between the 8am and 9am hour for the N59 junction to the north of the Octagon. This is below the 5% threshold where further assessment (TIA) would be required per Section 7.5 of Volume 2 of the CDP. I note that based on the updated TTA, the worst case increase is for 12 no. two-way cars in an hour in the town centre.
- 7.6.3. I note the appellant has challenged the conducting of the traffic surveys outside of the tourist high season. I note that the hotel would operate year round and that the TTA factors in worse case scenarios including taking account of the existing and future traffic demands locally using TII annual traffic growth rates. I consider this standard approach to be reasonable and I note it found negligible traffic increases would result at the 4 junctions initially examined. I do not consider that significant congestion would result, including in relation to right-turn movements from Peter Street into Church Street.
- 7.6.4. Overall, in relation to both the effect on the junctions in the vicinity of the development, including traffic exiting from the Leisure Centre car park to James Street, I am satisfied that there would be no significant traffic increases from the proposed development such that I consider traffic impact to be acceptable.

Car parking

- 7.6.5. In relation to car parking, I note that the issues raised in relation to internal circulation raised by the P.A. were addressed to their satisfaction following F.I.. These show compliance with DMURS standards for the internal footpaths and crossings as requested and also the 3m wide public footpath. Should permission be granted, I recommend a condition to ensure such standards are complied with.
- 7.6.6. I note the proposed development is for 72 hotel bedrooms with 6 being removed. This would result in a net increase of 66 bedrooms. I note that per Table 7 of Volume 2 that there is a requirement for one space per bedroom. This would result in a requirement for 66 spaces. The additional dining room area proposed is 183sqm which would result in a requirement for 18 spaces. I note there is an additional requirement for 9 no. employees relevant per the F.I. car parking submission. This gives a total requirement of 99 spaces for the proposed development. I note that 88 car spaces are proposed in the basement and 20 spaces are proposed in the surface level car park as public spaces.
- 7.6.7. I note that the 20 surface spaces proposed are in lieu of the 7 spaces to be eliminated at the Leisure Centre car park to facilitate the proposed car park exit which gives a net additional 13 spaces in this regard.
- 7.6.8. I note the car parking calculation submitted with the application which is based on the planning history of the site. I note that this shows a net credit of 28 spaces prior to the subject application. However, I note that this basis of calculation does not supply the starting point in relation to the permitted/established development prior to the application permitted under reg. ref. 14/263 and does not account for staff provision. I therefore do not consider that this can be relied upon for a cumulative assessment.
- 7.6.9. If the proposed development is considered on its own, I note 99 spaces are required and 101 (net) spaces are proposed which would result in two extra spaces. However, I note that the proposed additional 66 (net bedrooms) would bring the total number of hotel rooms to 144 from the existing 78. This would result in a requirement for 144 spaces plus 18 spaces for the dining area and 9 staff spaces and this totals to a requirement for 171 spaces.
- 7.6.10. I note there are 19 existing parking spaces and that the 101 (net) proposed would bring this to 120 spaces. There would therefore be a shortfall of 51 spaces or 30% of

the requirement. I note that Table 7 states that “*All new development proposals will normally be required to meet the minimum Parking Standards*”. However, I note that Objective TVHO 12 allows for a reduction in car parking standard requirements for urban infill and brownfield locations and subject to the individual merits of the application with respect to performance criteria.

- 7.6.11. In my opinion, considering the c.30% car parking shortfall, noting the brownfield infill location, the accessible town centre location for staff and some users who may come by bus or train and the high quality design of the proposed extension, I consider that the proposed car parking shortfall is justified and acceptable. I note also that permission was granted at the Supervalu car park to the south-east for valet car parking for the hotel for 64 spaces in January 2022 and this permission has not been implemented to date. If it was, it would result in a marginal level of car parking above that of the minimum requirement which I also consider acceptable.
- 7.6.12. I note that Section 7.12.5 provides for a development contribution in lieu of car parking provision where there is a shortfall. I note that shortfalls are charged at a rate of 2,382 euros per space in the Development Contribution Scheme which is referenced in Section 1.4 Appendix 2 of the CDP in relation to the payment of general financial contributions offset the cost of infrastructure works. Given that no such infrastructure works are proposed, similar to the P.A. I do not consider it appropriate to apply a contribution for any parking shortfall in this instance.
- 7.6.13. I note there is a requirement that a minimum of 10% of the proposed car parking spaces be provided with electrical connection points to allow for functional electric vehicle charging and that the remaining car parking spaces shall be fitted with ducting for electrical connection points to allow for the future fit out of charging points at up to 20% of car parking spaces.
- 7.6.14. Table 8 sets out Disabled Parking Standards which for 76 to 100 spaces is 5 spaces, over 100 is 3 spaces per additional 100 and there would be 6 disabled spaces which I consider accords with this standard. Should permission be granted, I recommend a specific condition be applied to ensure the required EV and disabled parking standards are adhered to.

7.7. Other Matters

- 7.7.1. I note that the appellant has alleged a conflict of interest of the Council in taking a decision to grant permission in this case. Based on the assertions put forward, I do not consider there to be a conflict of interest in this regard and I note that the P.A. would have been limited to the consideration of planning issues only in relation to its decision. As well as reviewing the decision of the P.A., I note that I have carried out this assessment de novo and that I have only had regard to planning matters in this assessment.
- 7.7.2. In relation to drainage matters, I note that the application includes a Stormwater Report prepared by John Britton Consulting. This proposes attenuation/infiltration using storm cells and outflow to the Council storm system. This is designed to limit, with a hydrobrake, peak discharges to less than 50% of the existing peak. I note that the P.A. had no issue with this. Should permission be granted, I recommend a standard SUDS condition be applied. I note also that details have been submitted in relation to sewer work diversions and water needs.
- 7.7.3. I note the Preliminary Construction Management Plan prepared by John Britton Consulting submitted at F.I. stage which outlines the construction works and methodology. Should permission be granted, I recommend a standard condition be applied in relation to same to ensure final details are agreed with the P.A. prior to commencement and also in relation to a construction traffic management plan.
- 7.7.4. I also recommend a standard road bond condition to ensure public infrastructure is returned to its previous state if affected during the works. I also recommend a waste management condition for the ongoing management of waste disposal operations given the size of the development. I note a standard Section 48 development contribution condition is required should permission be granted.

8.0 EIA Screening

- 8.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The

proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

9.0 **AA Screening and Appropriate Assessment**

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 (see Appendix 3), I conclude that it is not possible to exclude that the proposed development alone will give rise to significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) European Site in view of the sites conservation objectives.

Appropriate Assessment is required. This determination is based on:

- The potential hydrological link from the site to the SAC via the Carrowbeg (Westport)_030 river waterbody which is c.30m to the north-west.
- The potential for silt or pollutants to be released from the site during construction.
- The location within a serviced urban area with available capacity noted at Westport WWTP.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

9.2. In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) in view of the conservation objectives of the site and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177V / was required.

Appropriate Assessment

9.3. Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS and all associated material submitted (see Appendix 4), I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of the site and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects. My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts.

- The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives or prevent or delay the restoration of favourable conservation condition for the qualifying interests of the SAC.
- The effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed in the Natura Impact Statement.
- Application of planning conditions to ensure the NIS mitigation measures are implemented.
- The determination of the Planning Authority.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken in accordance with Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), as transposed by the European Communities (Water Policy) Regulations 2003, as amended, and with regard to the applicable River Basin Management Plan.
- 10.2. The receiving water environment has been identified and assessed, see Appendix 5 attached. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and the mitigation measures incorporated into the design, which can be conditioned, it is concluded that the proposed development would not:
- Result in deterioration of the ecological, chemical, or quantitative status of any relevant surface water or groundwater body;
 - Increase pollutant loading or alter the hydrological regime of any receiving watercourse;
 - Prevent or impede achievement of environmental objectives under the applicable River Basin Management Plan.
- 10.3. Any residual risks are capable of being addressed through the proposed mitigation measures outlined in the revised NIS, mitigation conditions and the implementation of a Construction Management Plan (CMP).
- 10.4. The proposed development is considered to be in compliance with the requirements of Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive.

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site within the town centre and the Westport ACA, the provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 and the Westport Local Area Plan 2024-2030, the brownfield infill nature of the site and associated policy encouraging appropriate compact development and tourism development in the town, to the nature of the tourism use in the context of the housing supply in the town and other tourism development in the town, to the height, scale, layout and form of the development, the proposed drainage scheme, and to the nature and scale of the proposed development with no significant traffic congestion or traffic safety issues likely to result, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would be acceptable.

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

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 14th day of January 2026, 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 mitigation measures contained in the submitted Natura Impact Statement (NIS), shall be implemented.

Reason: To protect the integrity of European Sites.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed buildings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

4. (a) The internal road network serving the proposed development including turning bays, junctions, parking areas, footpaths, and kerbs and the underground car park shall comply with the detailed construction standards of the planning authority for such works and design standards outlined in Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS).

(b) Footpaths shall be dished at road junctions in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority. Details of all locations and materials to be used shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of amenity and of traffic and pedestrian safety.

5. Provision shall be made for a loading bay at Peter Street as shown on the Site Plan (drawing no. 88111) submitted to the Planning Authority on the 14th day of January 2026. Details of this provision, including swept manoeuvring paths, bay dimensions etc. shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details and this shall be subject to the findings of a detailed Stage 2 and Stage 3 Road Safety Audit which shall be carried out for the development and which shall be implemented.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory provision and layout for commercial vehicles, in the interest of traffic safety.

6. Parking for the development shall be provided in accordance with a detailed parking layout which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The layout shall provide for:-

(a) The minimum number electronic vehicle charging points (10% of the proposed car parking spaces) and the fitting of ducting for electrical connection points for the remaining spaces required in accordance with Section 7.12 of Volume 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028.

(b) Disabled parking in accordance with the standards set out in Table 8 of Volume 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028.

Reason: Reason: To ensure a satisfactory provision and layout for vehicles, in the interest of traffic management.

7. Drainage arrangements, including for the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

8. A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials and for the ongoing operation of these facilities shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment.

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

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

10. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust, management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste.
Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

11. A detailed construction traffic management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site.
Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and convenience.

12. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the reinstatement of public roads which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.
Reason: To ensure that the public road is satisfactorily reinstated, if necessary.

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

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

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

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

Ciarán Daly

Planning Inspector

12th June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500916-MO-26
Proposed Development Summary	Extension to hotel, 72 no. bedrooms, alterations and change of use of existing restaurant premises into hotel goods receiving area and all associated site works. The planning application is supported by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS).
Development Address	The Wyatt Hotel, The Octagon, Westport, County Mayo.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	

<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	<p>State the Class here</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>Class 10(b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere.</p>

<p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Hotel extension on a site area of 0.515ha (site is within “other parts of a built-up area”).</p>
<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</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: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-500916-MO-26
Proposed Development Summary	Extension to hotel, 72 no. bedrooms, alterations and change of use of existing restaurant premises into hotel goods receiving area and all associated site works. The planning application is supported by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS).
Development Address	The Wyatt Hotel, The Octagon, Westport, County Mayo.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development comes forward as a standalone project, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no significant risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development)	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed

<p>in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The development is situated in an urban area on zoned and serviced town centre lands. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. It is located adjacent to a protected structure, Wyatt Theatre, is opposite the Glendinning Monument, a protected structure, and is a short distance from Westport House (protected structure) and demesne. The development would be c.30m uphill of the Carrowbeg (Westport)_030 river waterbody.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</p> <p>Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Likelihood of Significant Effects</p>	<p>Conclusion in respect of EIA</p>

There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
---	-----------------------------

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: Standard AA Screening Determination

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: PL-500916-MO-26	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics Extension to hotel, 72 no. bedrooms, alterations and change of use of existing restaurant premises into hotel goods receiving area and all associated site works. The planning application is supported by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS).	
Brief description of project	The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a three storey rear and side extension over a semi-basement car park with a total gross floor area of 5,333sqm. • The extension will comprise 72 no. bedrooms including the alteration of some existing bedrooms. • 88 no. new basement parking spaces and 20 no. new public surface car park spaces off Church Street. • Converting ground floor six bedrooms to increase the size of the existing dining area. • The application is accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement.
Brief description of development site characteristics and	Three storey rear /side extension of 72 hotel rooms on a site area of 0.515ha.

potential impact mechanisms	Construction stage: pollutants to water channels. Operational stage: pollutants to water channels.
Screening report	Y – Screening for Appropriate Assessment and Natura Impact Statement prepared by Delichon Ecology
Natura Impact Statement	Y – Screening for Appropriate Assessment and Natura Impact Statement prepared by Delichon Ecology
Relevant submissions	None.

--

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

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482).	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Coastal lagoons [1150] Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]	c.1.1km to the west	Potential hydrological connection via overland flow, receiving drainage channels and Carrowbeg	Y

	<p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Machairs (* in Ireland) [21A0]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p><i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355]</p> <p><i>Phoca vitulina</i> (Harbour Seal) [1365]</p> <p>NPWS, 19th July 2011.</p>		<p>Westport_030 river waterbody which is c.30m to the north-west.</p>	
<p>Brackloon Woods SAC (site code 000471).</p>	<p>Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>NPWS, 19th March 2021</p>	<p>c.4.4km to the south-west</p>	<p>No, due to distance and direction of hydrological connections away from site</p>	<p>N</p>

--	--	--	--	--

¹ Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report
² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species
³ if no connections: N

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

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
<p>Site 1: Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482).</p> <p><u>QI list</u></p> <p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Coastal lagoons [1150]</p> <p>Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</p>	<p>Direct</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Indirect</p> <p>Potential negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sediment and construction related pollution.</p> <p>Operational stage: potential discharge of surface water generated by the development with contaminants used during the management and</p>	<p>Potential negative effects on habitat quality/ function and prey availability/ undermine conservation objectives related to water quality.</p> <p>Possibility of significant effects cannot be ruled out without further analysis and assessment</p>

<p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1330]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Machairs (* in Ireland) [21A0]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p><i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355]</p>	<p>maintenance of the development.</p>	
--	--	--

Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365]		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site		
<p>It is not possible to exclude the possibility that proposed development alone would result significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) from effects associated with construction related pollutants/silt run-off.</p> <p>An appropriate assessment is required on the basis of the possible effects of the project 'alone'. Further assessment in-combination with other plans and projects is not required at screening stage.</p> <p>Proceed to AA.</p>		
Screening Determination		

Finding of no likely significant effects

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 will give rise to significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) European Site in view of the sites conservation objectives. Appropriate Assessment is required.

This determination is based on:

- The potential hydrological link from the site to the SAC via the Carrowbeg Westport_030 river waterbody which is c.30m to the north-west.
- The potential for silt or pollutants to be released from the site during construction.
- The location within a serviced urban area with available capacity noted at Westport WWTP.
- The screening determination of the Planning Authority.

Appendix 4 – Appropriate Assessment and AA Determination

Appropriate Assessment

The requirements of Article 6(3) as related to appropriate assessment of a project under part XAB, sections 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) are considered fully in this section.

Taking account of the preceding screening determination, the following is an appropriate assessment of the implications of the proposed development in view of the relevant conservation objectives of Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) based on scientific information provided by the applicant.

The information relied upon includes the following:

- Screening for Appropriate Assessment and Natura Impact Statement prepared by Delichon Ecology
- National Parks and Wildlife Service data.

I am satisfied that the information provided is adequate to allow for Appropriate Assessment. I am satisfied that all aspects of the project which could result in significant effects are considered and assessed in the NIS and mitigation measures designed to avoid or reduce any adverse effects on site integrity are included and assessed for effectiveness.

Submissions/observations

None.

NAME OF SAC/ SPA (SITE CODE): Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482)

Summary of Key issues that could give rise to adverse effects (from screening stage):

- Water quality degradation (construction)
- Invasive species

See Table 6-1 NIS

Qualifying Interest features likely to be affected	Conservation Objectives Targets and attributes summary	Potential adverse effects	Mitigation measures (summary) NIS SECTION 6.2
<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Coastal lagoons [1150]</p> <p>Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]</p> <p>Atlantic salt meadows (Glaucopuccinellietalia maritimae) [1330]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p>	<p>Maintain / restore favourable conservation condition</p> <p>1013 Geyer's whorl snail <i>Vertigo geyeri</i> – under review.</p> <p>1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide. Attributes and targets: permanent habitat area is stable or increasing, subject to natural processes. The following sediment communities should be maintained in a natural condition: Intertidal sandy mud with <i>Tubificoides benedii</i> and <i>Pygospio elegans</i> community complex; Sandy mud with polychaetes and bivalves community complex; and fine sand dominated by <i>Nephtys cirrosa</i> community.</p> <p>1150 Coastal Lagoons. Attributes and targets: No decline in habitat distributions, habitat area stable. Maintain current spatial and temporal variation in salinity regime. Maintain current annual water level fluctuations. Maintain/ restore freshwater discharge regime. Maintain current weir structure at Furnace Lough to ensure maintenance of the current salinity regime. Maintain annual median chlorophyll in Furnace Lough at less than 2.5µg/L. Maintain annual median MRP in Furnace Lough at less than 0.01mg/L. Maintain annual median DIN (Dissolved inorganic</p>	<p>Construction stage: Silt laden and/or hydrocarbon polluted water run-off leading to diminution of water quality and habitat quality/ function and prey availability.</p> <p>Operational stage: surface water discharge from the development and use of contaminants from the management and maintenance of the development.</p>	<p>[Best practice pollution control measures Application of industry standard controls. CMP, Supervision by Site Manager and Environmental Officer as required including during construction, inter alia: maintenance of silt fencing, bunded refuelling area, storage tanks with secondary containment, inspect any imported soil to identify any invasive species, lorries and mixers shall not be washed on the site, no concrete production on the site, noise control measures, no fuel storage on site.</p>

<p>Machairs (* in Ireland) [21A0]</p> <p>Old sessile oak woods with Ilex and Blechnum in the British Isles [91A0]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Phoca vitulina (Harbour Seal) [1365]</p>	<p>nitrogen) in Furnace Lough at less than 0.15mg/L. Maintain annual median BOD (Biological Oxygen Demand) in Furnace Lough at less than 2.0mg/L. Maintain/increase the depth of submergent macrophyte colonisation of the lagoon. Maintain number and extent of listed lagoonal specialists, subject to natural variation. Maintain listed lagoon specialists, subject to natural variation. Negative indicator species absent or under control.</p> <p>1160 Large shallow inlets and bays. Attributes and Targets: permanent habitat area is stable or increasing; Maintain the natural extent of the Zostera dominated and maërl dominated communities. Maintain the high quality of Zostera dominated community. Maintain the high quality of maërl dominated communities. The following communities should be maintained in a natural condition: Sandy mud with polychaetes and bivalves community complex; Fine sand dominated by Nephthys cirrosa community; Intertidal sandy mud with Tubificoides benedii and Pygospio elegans community complex; Shingle; and Reef.</p> <p>1210 Annual vegetation of drift lines. Attributes and Targets: Area stable or increasing, subject to natural processes, including erosion and succession. No decline in habitat distribution. Maintain the natural circulation of sediment and organic matter, without any physical obstructions. Maintain the range of coastal habitats including transitional zones, subject to natural processes including erosion and succession. Maintain the presence of species-poor communities with typical species: Cakile maritima, Honckenya peploides, Salsola kali and Atriplex spp. Negative indicator species (including non-natives) to represent less than 5% vegetation cover.</p> <p>1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks. Attributes and Targets: Habitat area stable or increasing subject to natural processes. No decline in habitat distribution. Maintain the natural circulation of sediment and organic</p>		<p>Operational stage measures include, inter alia: new car park drain which will connect to a dedicated wet well also acting as a silt trap before passing through a petrol interceptor prior to joining the combined sewer system. Storm water run-off to be managed with enhanced on site infiltration, treatment of potentially contaminated run-off.</p>
---	--	--	--

	<p>matter, without any physical obstructions. Maintain the range of coastal habitats including transitional zones, subject to natural processes including erosion and succession. Maintain the presence of species-poor communities with typical species: <i>Honckenya peploides</i>, <i>Beta vulgaris</i> ssp. <i>maritima</i>, <i>Crithmum maritimum</i>, <i>Tripleurospermum maritimum</i>, <i>Glaucium flavum</i> and <i>Silene uniflora</i>. Negative indicator species (including non-natives) to represent less than 5% vegetation cover.</p> <p>1330 Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glaucopuccinellietalia maritimae</i>). Attributes and Targets: Habitat area stable or increasing subject to natural processes. No decline in habitat distribution. Maintain/restore natural circulation of sediments and organic matter, without any physical obstructions. Maintain creek and pan structure, subject to natural processes, including erosion and succession. Maintain natural tidal regime. Maintain the range of coastal habitats including transitional zones, subject to natural processes including erosion and succession. Maintain structural variation within sward. Maintain more than 90% area outside creeks vegetated. Maintain range of subcommunities with typical species listed in Saltmarsh Monitoring Project. No significant expansion of <i>Spartina</i>. No new sites for this species and an annual spread of less than 1% where it is already known to occur.</p> <p>1355 Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i>. Attributes and Targets: No significant decline in distribution, extent of terrestrial area, extent of marine habitat, extent of freshwater habitat, couching sites and holts or fish biomass available. No significant increase in barriers to activity.</p> <p>1365 Common seal <i>Phoca vitulina</i>. Attributes and Targets: Species range within the site should not be restricted by artificial barriers to site use. The breeding sites should be maintained in a natural condition. The moult haul-out sites should be maintained in a natural condition. The resting haul-out sites should be maintained in a natural condition.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Human activities should occur at levels that do not adversely affect the harbour seal population at the site.</p> <p>2110 Embryonic shifting dunes. Attributes and Targets: Habitat area stable or increasing and no decline in habitat distribution. Maintain the natural circulation of sediment and organic matter, without any physical obstructions. Maintain the range of coastal habitats including transitional zones, subject to natural processes including erosion and succession. More than 95% of Elytrigia and/or Leymus should be healthy. Maintain the presence of species-poor communities with typical species: Elytrigia juncea and/or Leymus arenarius. Negative indicator species (including non-natives) to represent less than 5% cover.</p> <p>2120 Shifting dunes along the shoreline with Ammophila arenaria ("white dunes"). Attributes and Targets: Habitat area stable or increasing and no decline in habitat distribution. Maintain the natural circulation of sediment and organic matter, without any physical obstructions. Maintain the range of coastal habitats including transitional zones. More than 95% of Ammophila and/or Leymus should be healthy. Maintain the presence of species-poor communities dominated by Ammophila arenaria and/or Leymus arenarius. Negative indicator species (including non-natives) to represent less than 5% cover.</p>		
<p>The above table is based on the documentation and information provided on the file and I am satisfied that the submitted NIS has identified the relevant attributes and targets of the Qualifying Interests.</p>			

Assessment of issues that could give rise to adverse effects view of conservation objectives

(i) Water quality degradation

Potential for polluted run-off during construction and operation stages to be transmitted via ground, drainage and river channels.

Mitigation measures and conditions

Best practice construction control measures including use of silt traps and petrol interceptors to prevent polluted run-off leaving the site during construction. Best practice surface water and storm water drainage measures including petrol interceptors to prevent polluted water leaving the site during operational stage.

(ii) Disturbance of mobile species

N/A

Mitigation measures and conditions

(iii) Spread of invasive species

None noted on the site. Walkover survey conducted.

Mitigation measures and conditions

Best practice measures such as inspection of soil deliveries to ensure none imported on to the site.

In-combination effects

I am satisfied that in-combination effects have been assessed adequately in the NIS. The applicant has demonstrated satisfactorily that no significant residual effects will remain post the application of mitigation measures and there is therefore no potential for in-combination effects.

Findings and conclusions

The applicant determined that following the implementation of mitigation measures the construction and operation of the proposed development alone, or in combination with other plans and projects, will not adversely affect the integrity of this European site.

Based on the information provided, I am satisfied that adverse effects arising from aspects of the proposed development can be excluded for the European sites considered in the appropriate Assessment. Mitigation measures are described to prevent ingress of silt laden surface water and hydrocarbons to waters in the vicinity. Monitoring measures are also proposed to ensure compliance and effective management of measures. I am

satisfied that the mitigation measures proposed to prevent adverse effects have been assessed as effective and can be implemented.

Reasonable scientific doubt

I am satisfied that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of adverse effects.

Site Integrity

The proposed development will not affect the attainment of the Conservation objectives of the Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482). Adverse effects on site integrity can be excluded and no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

Appropriate Assessment Conclusion: Integrity Test

In screening the need for Appropriate Assessment, it was determined that the proposed development could result in significant effects on Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) in view of the conservation objectives of the site and that Appropriate Assessment under the provisions of S177V / was required.

Following an examination, analysis and evaluation of the NIS and all associated material submitted , I consider that adverse effects on site integrity of the Clew Bay Complex SAC (site code 001482) can be excluded in view of the conservation objectives of the site and that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects.

My conclusion is based on the following:

- Detailed assessment of construction and operational impacts.
- The proposed development will not affect the attainment of conservation objectives or prevent or delay the restoration of favourable conservation condition for the qualifying interests of the SAC.
- The effectiveness of mitigation measures proposed in the Natura Impact Statement.
- Application of planning conditions to ensure the NIS mitigation measures are implemented.
- The determination of the Planning Authority.

Appendix 5 – WFD Impact Assessment Scoping

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500916-MO-26	Townland, address	The Wyatt Hotel, The Octagon, Westport, County Mayo.
Description of project		Extension to hotel, 72 no. bedrooms, alterations and change of use of existing restaurant premises into hotel goods receiving area and all associated site works. The planning application is supported by a Natura Impact Statement (NIS).	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The urban site consists of a hotel building, courtyard and grassland area to the rear.	
Proposed surface water details		SUDS measures proposed as part of the scheme.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Uisce Éireann capacity register notes capacity available.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Uisce Éireann capacity register notes capacity available.	
Others?			

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection

Identified water body	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater) (Consider all phases)	Mitigation Measures proposed	Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?
Yes	Carrowbeg (Westport)_030 river waterbody (IE_WE_32C050300)	Poor	At risk	Urban run-off and stormwater run-off, combined sewer overflows, channelisation and culverts, industrial waste.	Surface water and storm water run-off via land, ground water, drainage channels.	Best practice construction measures and operational measures to ensure no silt laden or polluted run-off from the site. Uisce Éireann capacity register notes available capacity. SUDS measures to ensure greenfield flow rates, no pollutants leave the site and petrol interceptor.	Yes, no residual impacts.
Yes	Newport groundwater body (IE_WE_G_0023)	Good	Not at risk	Polluted surface water run-off, agricultural run-off (nutrients and pathogens), domestic wastewater treatment systems and forestry operations.	Surface water and storm water run-off via land, ground water, drainage channels	Best practice construction measures and operational measures to ensure no silt laden or polluted run-off from the site. Uisce Éireann capacity register notes available capacity. SUDS measures to ensure greenfield flow rates, no pollutants leave the site and petrol interceptor.	Yes, no residual impacts.