



Development	40. no apartments and all site works.
Location	Clybaun Road and Western Distributor Road , Knocknacarra , Galway City
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560034
Applicant(s)	Highcross Developments Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Kieran & Angela Brennan Kenneth & Noelle McCarthy Hawthorn Place Residents Association
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	11 June 2026
Inspector	Claire McVeigh

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	6
4.0	Planning History.....	13
5.0	Policy Context.....	15
6.0	EIA Screening.....	18
7.0	The Appeal	19
8.0	Assessment	28
9.0	AA Screening.....	36
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	36
11.0	Recommendation.....	37
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	37
13.0	Conditions.....	37
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	45
	Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination	48
	Appendix 3: Standard AA Screening Determination.....	51

1.0 Site Location and Description

The subject site (stated site area of 0.310ha) is located within the suburb of Knocknacarra in Galway City. The site is located northeast of roundabout (referred to as 'Athy' roundabout) at the Junction of the Clybaun Road and Western Distributor Road.

Currently there is a detached two storey dwelling (vacant and boarded up) set within a large garden with existing vehicular access off the Clybaun Road and pedestrian gateway. A bus stop is located immediately north of the existing vehicle access to the site. There are mature trees along/within the southern boundary of the side and the eastern boundary of the site. An attractive stone wall borders the western and southern boundaries of the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

The proposed development comprises the redevelopment of an existing infill and brownfield site to provide for the construction of 40 no. apartment units.

The development comprises of:

- Demolition of 1 no. existing two storey detached dwelling (250.60sqm gross floor space).
- Construction of 2 no. apartment blocks (namely Block A to the west & Block B to the east) (4, 401.00sqm gross floor space).

Block A: 6 storey flat roof building with additional stairwell & elevator shaft projection at roof level is proposed, to accommodate 22 no. apartments as set out in Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: Block A (22 no. apartments in total)

3 no. bed (5-person Type 4) apartments	5 (23%)
2 no. bed (4-person Type 3) apartments	10 (45%)
2 no. bed (3-person Type 2) apartments	6 (27%)
1 no. 1 bed (2-person Type 1) apartment	1 (5%)
Ground floor provision for storage, bicycle parking/storage, refuse storage, communal space/additional storage space, electrical room and plant room.	

Block B: 5 storey flat roof building with additional stairwell & elevator shaft projection at roof level is proposed, to accommodate 18 no. apartments as set out in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Block B (18 no. apartments in total)

3 no. bed (5-person Type 4) apartments	4 (22%)
2 no. bed (4-person Type 3) apartments	8 (44%)
2 no. bed (3-person Type 2) apartments	5 (28%)
1 no. 1 bed (2-person Type 1) apartment	1 (6%)
Ground floor provision for storage, bicycle parking/storage, refuse storage, communal space/additional storage space, electrical room and plant room.	

As a percentage of the proposed total number of units the two-bedroom (4 person) unit typology is the largest within the mix.

Table 2.3: Mix of unit types (Including Block A and Block B)

3 no. bed (5-person Type 4) apartments	9 (22%)
2 no. bed (4-person Type 3) apartments	18 (45%)
2 no. bed (3-person Type 2) apartments	11 (28%)
1 no. 1 bed (2-person Type 1) apartment	2 (5%)
Total 40 no. apartments.	

In addition, it is proposed to construct a detached single storey storage building, to provide for Universal Design Vehicle Storage (Cargo Bike Storage) and provision for potential Electrical Sub Station,

Provision for a south facing public open space area, comprising of a playground, seating, table tennis area with covered seating, hard and soft landscaping.

Provision for 24 no. surface carparking spaces within a shared surface/home zone area, visitor bicycle parking spaces, together with revised boundary treatments and signage.

Revised access arrangements to include for an upgraded vehicular entrance/exit and footpath connections onto the Clybaun road, together with the potential for future pedestrian connectivity to the Western Distributor Road.

Connection to existing public mains water infrastructure, including connection to existing surface water and foul drainage networks, to serve the development, together with all associated site development works and services

The planning application documentation includes:

- Part V letter of understanding
- Planning Statement prepared by *Enviroplan Consulting Limited*
- Scheme Sustainability Statement prepared by *Enviroplan Consulting Limited*
- Confirmation of Feasibility from *Uisce Eireann*
- Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Report prepared by Traffic Transport and Road Safety Associates Ltd.
- Traffic and Transport Assessment Report prepared by *Traffic Transport and Road Safety Associates Ltd.*
- Mobility Management Plan Report prepared by Traffic Transport and Road Safety Associates Ltd.
- Landscape Design Statement Report prepared by *Radharc Landscape Design*
- An Acoustic Review of the Potential Noise from Car Parking Areas at Residential Dwellings at Hawthorn Place Report prepared by *ICAN Acoustics*
- Internal Daylight and Sunlight Assessment Report prepared by *EEABS*
- Shadow Analysis on Proposed Clybaun Rd Residential Development Report prepared by *RealSim Ltd.*
- Wind Microclimate Analysis Report prepared by *B-Fluid Ltd*
- Bat Transect & Roost Inspection Report prepared by *Enviroplan Consulting Limited*

In response to further information requested the applicant has submitted revised documentation and drawings. I highlight to the Commission that no change in the

proposed number or mix of units is proposed within the revised particulars and the density as proposed remains at 129 units per hectare (uph).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

Decision

On 18 February 2026 the planning authority granted permission subject to 25 no. conditions.

Conditions

Condition no. 1: development to be carried out in accordance with the application made on 10 February 2025, as amended by revised details and drawings received on the 22 January 2026.

Condition no. 4: With regards to the above ground floor balconies with a north facing element, the following shall be applicable;

- a. Northern elevation side screens to the edges of the balconies shall be erected to a height of 1.8 metres taken from the floor of the balcony, these shall be permanently glazed in obscured glass.
- b. A qualified bonded engineer, qualifications and insurance details to be included, who shall submit a report and photographs, to the Planning Authority, certifying their erection, this report shall be to the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

Condition no. 6: The residential unit shall not be used for short term lettings as defined in the Residential Tenancies (Amendment) Act 2019 and the Planning and Development Act 2000 (Exempted Development) (No. 2) Regulations 2019.

Condition no. 8: Prior to the commencement of development, a piece/s of artwork shall be provided within this development. The evolution of the design should include the creation of an aesthetic object/s, either reflecting the natural or built environment, or an abstract piece all of which should allow for the generation experiences which can be shared with others within this new community. The artwork proposed for this development shall be sponsored by the developer. The details and timeframe for its erection shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Condition no. 19: The developer shall undertake full road width realignment on the section of the Clybaun Road, which the development fronts onto. Exact details shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for written approval prior to the commencement of development. The developer shall submit an undertaking that the additional width on the Clybaun Road shall form part of the public road system under the charge of the Local Authority.

3.1 Planning Authority Reports

3.1.1 Planning Reports

- Initial report (dated 02/04/2025) Considers that the proposed development would not impact upon bat species as per the submitted Bat Survey. Notes the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which outlines that the expected increase in flood risk as a result of site development is low and increased flood risk downstream of the development is considered to be low. Further information sought in relation to the following:

- screening for appropriate assessment,
- a reduction in the density of units proposed,
- redesign of Block B to ensure that it does not extend beyond the rear building line of the rear of the Bin Sin Apartments by more than ground floor level,
- provision of a privacy strip for ground floor apartments,
- justification required for the proposed reduced car parking provision or parking to be revised to provide 1 space per unit,
- clarification on proposed communal amenity space size excluding car parking areas, access roadways and incidental areas,
- revisions to design of car parking layout and provision of a set down/pick up space,
- provision of larger amenity space to the ground floor apartments,
- revisions to the pedestrian access point along the southern boundary to provide privacy to proposed no. 1 ground floor apartment in Block A,
- clarification on site footprint and legal ownership of land adjacent to the northern boundary of the site,
- revisions to the footpath connections and cycle entry/exit,

- demonstrate compliance with the requirements for nature base solutions of the management of rainwater and surface water runoff,
 - provision of play space,
 - revised boundary planting proposals as the Prunus species is not permitted,
 - stone clad finish to replace the proposed concrete post wall to the north of the car park.
- Report following receipt of further information (dated 10/02/2026) is in agreement with the Screening for AA conclusions, the density of 129 uph is acceptable noting the applicant's justification as the site would fall within an urban neighbourhood indicated in point (iii) of Table 3.2 of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines (SRDCSG) given its proximity to the Bus Connects Red Route which indicates a bus frequency of 10-12 minutes, taking into account the submitted shadow study (prepared by EEABS) considers the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the potential impacts of the proposed development on the Binsin Apartments, privacy strip of 1.5m provided at ground floor windows and larger spaces for the ground floor terraces, the reduction in car parking provision is acceptable, communal open space of 1,129 sq.m is acceptable, the applicant has demonstrated that the car parking proposed is in compliance and has now provided a dedicated pickup/set down delivery area and autotrack plan to illustrate that waste can be collected without impacting on the communal open space or car parking, privacy from pedestrian/cyclist access to unit no. 1 has been provided, solicitor's letter noted in respect to the ownership/site boundaries, accepts that site access for pedestrians and cyclist accords with the National Cycle Manual and notes the modifications to car parking layout, pedestrian footpaths and provision of recreational facility in communal open space which are acceptable. Recommends a grant of permission subject to condition.

3.1.2 Other Technical Reports

- Drainage: No objections to surface water proposals subject to conditions
- Active Travel: Note that the proposed development does not interfere with the proposed active travel project on the Western Distributor Road. Recommended further information in respect to the detailed design including demonstrating that footpaths/access

routes compliance with Universal Design Approach and footpath connections along WDR and Clybaun Road to meet the required 2.50m footpath width as per DMURS Link Streets.

- Transportation Department (T&I): Recommended further information in respect to the proposed number of car parking and cycle parking spaces, potential impact on adjoining active travel schemes, clarification that the design access meets the requirements of the National Cycle Manual for pedestrian and cycle access.
- Recreation & Amenity (Parks): Recommended further information - main concern that the percentage of open space provision is below what it should be and that nature-based solutions for drainage are not optimised. The applicant needs to demonstrate how they comply with the Development Plan standards for recreational facilities and the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022, Section 4.13 which sets out how children’s play needs should be catered for.

Further recommends that the applicant should be conditioned to provide a financial contribution within the terms of Section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) in lieu of provision within an application site, as per Objective 5.1 of the Sustainable Residential and Compact Settlement Guidelines. This contribution could be used in the development of the proposed nearby Teen Park and/or Knocknacarra Hill park, Priority projects identified in the draft Green Spaces Strategy, for delivery to meet the growing recreational needs of the western neighbourhoods, and the amenity needs within the walking catchment of the development.

3.1.3 Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.1.4 Third Party Observations

The following submissions were made and further submissions, where applicable, following receipt of further information is noted:

No.	Name
1	Kenneth and Noelle McCarthy (plus submission on further information) .
2	Paul and Olive Munroe (plus submission on further information)

3	Dermot O'Connor
4	Marie and Jim Lucey (plus submission made on further information)
5	Michael Corcoran
6	Kieran Brennan and Angela Finnerty (plus submission made on further information)
7	Siobhan Falvey (plus submission on further information)
8	John M.Gallagher (as instructed by Alan Curran Chairperson of the Hawthorn Place Residents Association) (plus submission on further information)
9	Brian McDonald and Helen McDonald (plus submission on further information)
10	James and Eileen Clasby
11	Maria Horkan (plus submission on further information)
12	Patricia Maclean
13	Dermot O'Neill and Eavan O'Neill
14	Orla Connaughton
15	Ms. H Larkin
16	David and Geraldine Baxter
17	Catriona O'Reilly (plus submission on further information)
18	Eileen Fitzgerald and Ray Flaherty (plus submission on further information)
19	Gerard and Teresa Walsh
20	Hawthorn Place Residents Association (submitted by Alan Curran) (check dated submission March 2025)
21	Siobhan and Enda Brennan
22	Crea McLaughlin

23	Fergus and Cathy Donaghue (plus further submission on further information)
24	Louise McKiernan and Con Wall (plus submission on further information)
25	Marion Ward
26	Laura and Stephen Shannon
27	Nuala Egan
28	Ronan Dunne and Eimear Coogan (plus submission on further information)
29	Sean Moloney (submission returned)
30	Tony and Maretha McVerry
31	Yvonne and Michael Flaherty
32	Ailbhe McLaughlin (plus submission on further information)
33	Breda Young
34	Carmel Horgan
35	Darragh O'Connor
36	Declan Weir (plus submission on further information)
37	Eamonn Toner
38	James Colm McLaughlin (plus submission on further information)
39	Bridie Kenny
40	John M Gallagher – clarification of case reference.

A number of the submissions generally welcome the proposal for redevelopment, however, the following concerns raised by the third parties have been grouped in the summary headings below:

- The site density exceeds the recommended range of 35-50 dwellings per ha. (Building Height and Density Guidelines), leading to poor living conditions for residents with inadequate communal open space,

- The over development of the area is not matched by employment opportunities contrary to the development plan,
- Plot ratio not in compliance with the development plan,
- Height, Scale and Mass, does not appropriately or proportionately integrate with its surroundings, the design is unsympathetic to the surrounding residential development and will seriously devalue property,
- Inadequate carparking provision would lead to overspill parking in nearby residential estates, problems already occurring in the vicinity of Sheridan's pub and Whiteoaks estate,
- The site is not well served by public transport and there is a lack of safe pedestrian and cycling infrastructure making it unsuitable for high-density residential development. A comprehensive traffic and transport assessment is required to be carried out by the Council and infrastructure improvements are put in place.
- Insufficient provision of public and private amenity open space,
- No schools' places available within the surrounding Knocknacarra area and increased burden on GP practices in Knocknacarra,
- Traffic congestion concerns and traffic safety, the upgraded vehicular entrance onto the Clybaun Road is too close to a major roundabout, the Road safety Audit reports 14 safety concerns which are not addressed in the application, the knock-on traffic effect will impact negatively in the local environs and most likely render the existing bus stop unsafe and unusable,
- Impact on daylight and overshadowing of private amenity areas, inaccuracies noted in shadow analysis submitted,
- Negative impact on residential amenity and increased overlooking from balconies on the northern elevation of the proposed apartments and noise concerns,
- Lack of availability of planning documents (IT issue with printing) limited time to review and assess the proposed development,

- Issues relating to matters of title and use of the road reserve to the front of the site is misleading,
- No contextual elevations or sections showing the impact of the proposed apartment blocks on the existing houses in Hawthorn Place, the design does not reflect the established aesthetic of the area and will disrupt the cohesion of the local streetscape,
- There have been issues in the past in this area with sewerage and wastewater backing up and flooding, the development would increase the likelihood of further problems of this nature.

4.0 Planning History

Planning register reference: 19/177 (ABP-307595-20) Permission granted (November 2020) for the redevelopment of an existing infill and brownfield site to provide for a mixed-use development comprising of a restaurant bar, two number neighbourhood retail units and six number apartments. The development will consist of demolition of one number existing two storey detached dwelling, construction of a mixed-use building over basement, with the overall height of the proposed building ranging from three storeys to the east to four storeys to the west. The basement will consist of a cellar, toilets, refuse areas, storage and ancillary services. The ground floor will provide for a restaurant and bar use, ancillary services and access areas, as well as two number neighbourhood retail units. The first floor will also accommodate the restaurant use and ancillary service areas. The second floor will provide for residential use, i.e. one number two-bedroom apartment, two number three-bedroom apartments, with private and communal amenity areas. The third floor will provide for residential use, i.e. one number three-bedroom apartment, one number two-bedroom apartment with private and communal amenity areas. The fourth floor (to the west of the building), will accommodate residential use, i.e. one number three-bedroom apartment and private amenity areas. Provision for public realm hard and soft landscaping including shared public open space/pedestrian plaza at ground floor level. Provision for 72 number surface car parking spaces, bicycle parking spaces, together with revised boundary treatments and signage. Revised access arrangements to include for a new vehicular entrance from the western Distributor Road and a vehicular exist onto the Clybaun Road, together with additional pedestrian connectivity to the public roads

bounding the site. Connection to existing public mains water infrastructure, including connection to existing surface water and foul drainage networks, to serve the development, together with all associated site development works and services, all on a site located north east of roundabout at the junction of the Clybaun Road and Western Distributor Road, Knocknacarra, Galway as amended by the further public notice received by the planning authority on the 2nd day of June 2020.

Note: Condition no. 2 omitted the proposed vehicular entrance off the Western Distributor Road.

Planning register reference: 15/338 Extension of duration on planning register reference 09/495 granted and extended until 2 December 2021.

Planning register reference: 15/134 (PL61.248068) ABP Refused permission for (1) the demolition of existing dwelling and (2) construction of a three storey over part-basement mixed-use commercial development. The development will consist of a retail unit, a financial services unit, offices and restaurant/bar with surface car parking and all associated site works at the northeast of the roundabout.

Reason for refusal:

1. Having regard to the prominent location of the site as an importance entrance site into Galway City, it is considered that the proposed development, consisting of a mix elevational, roof and window styles and four different types of external materials and excessive signage, would be incongruous in terms of its design and would set an undesirable precedent for future development in this area. The proposed development would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would be contrary to the stated policy of the planning authority, as set out in the current Development Plan and Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas – Guidelines for Planning Authorities” and the accompanying Best Practice Design Manual, in relation to urban development and urban renewal and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is considered that the car parking provision for the proposed development and, in particular the lack of sufficient on-site car parking spaces, would be seriously deficient and would be inadequate to cater for the parking demand generated by the proposed development, would result in on-street parking and tend to create serious

traffic congestion on the adjoining roads, and would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard.

Planning register reference: 09/495 Granted by ABP, Permission for the demolition of an existing dwellinghouse and the construction of a 75-bed nursing home. The development will be 4 storeys in height and includes basement carparking and all associated site development works and services.

Planning register reference: 08/47 Granted permission for the development of a 0.313ha site. The proposed development (total gross internal area 4910 sq.m) consists of the demolition of 1 no. existing detached dwelling (150.6sqm) and the construction of a mixed use development comprising 4 no. neighbourhood retail units (766sqm); 4 no. open plan office units and associated ancillary facilities (669sqm); 13 no. residential units (1047sqm) with associated basement and surface car parking (totalling 101 no. spaces), landscaping, plant/storage, site works and services. The height of the proposed development is 4 storeys over 1 no. basement level with an architecturally designed corner feature (proposed height 21.04m over ground level) proposed at the western gable end. The proposed development will be accessed via an existing entrance from the Clybaun Road.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029

Zoning R: To provide residential development and for associated support development, which will ensure the protection of existing residential amenity and will contribute to sustainable residential neighbourhoods.

Part of the subject is unzoned (white lands) which sits outside the existing site stone boundary wall.

Section 1.8.5 Galway City Urban Density and Building Height Study (UDBHS) This study was commissioned in the context of reviewing the application of Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines to Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines (2018) to Galway City and to inform the Core Strategy. The study provides a coherent analysis of the existing spatial structure. It reviewed where the potential for intensification through increased densities and/or height could achieve the most efficient and effective use of land and make a positive contribution to the character of and liveability of the city and the need to

accommodate the target increase in population sustainably. It gave consideration to the suitability and sensitivity of areas to change and the need to respect the unique built and natural heritage and character of the city.

It focused on the opportunities afforded by investment in sustainable transport and the distribution of services and amenities as well as reviewing the emerging potential of the Regeneration and Opportunity Sites for a mix of uses. Critically it emphasised the need for any increase in densities to be framed in quality architecture and adherence to good urban design principles.

3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Outer Suburbs ...there is opportunity to further consolidate these neighbourhoods through the development of existing serviced and zoned residential land... The western outer suburbs largely comprises the Knocknacarra, Ballyburke, Ballymoneen and Letteragh residential communities. These suburbs have a mix of densities, house types and sizes with newer developments in particular along the Western Distributer Road, Ballymoneen Road and Letteragh accommodating a greater diversity in house type. Local centres are designated to provide services to meet the daily needs of the resident population. The designated district centre at the Gateway Retail Park provides the main cluster of commercial activity to serve these neighbourhoods and a wider catchment. The area is also served by a number of important community facilities including schools, a community centre and church. The green network for this area includes the city park linking Barna Woods, Cappagh Park and Lough Rusheen and smaller parks and open spaces.

Policy 3.4 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Outer Suburbs

Chapter 11 Land Use Zoning Objectives and Development Standards and Guidelines including 11.3.1 Outer suburbs

11.27 Art/Cultural Amenity Large-scale development shall include provision for a professional piece of artwork, agreed in conjunction with the Council, which shall be located within an agreed area, accessible to the public and sponsored by the developer and of value in accordance with that set out in the Per Cent for Art Scheme 2020.

5.2 Galway Urban Density and Building Height Study (UDBHS) September 2021 (Supporting documents of Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029)

Section 19.2 West – Knocknacarra, Ballyburke, Ballymoneen:

DEVELOPMENT GUIDANCE

- Prevailing densities: Aside from the contrasting scale of development at the Gateway Retail Park, the prevailing housing density is in the region of 25 – 30 dph, more recent developments have achieved between 30 and 40 dph.
- Densities open for consideration: With good levels of infrastructure supporting the establishment of this relatively recent neighbourhood, there is significant scope for further phases of housing development on existing zoned and serviced lands. Within the context of a stable and established residential neighbourhood, densities should seek to make the best use of land, targeting levels of up to 35- 40 dph.
- Prevailing heights: Building heights are generally 2 storeys across the majority of the area. More recent developments with mixed unit types are between 2 - 3 storeys.
- Heights open for consideration: New development should respect the scale of recent development. Key junctions and nodes of activities present opportunities to provide more urban enclosure and a sense of clustering of activities with 3 - 4 storey development.

5.3 Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines

Having considered the nature of the proposal, the receiving environment, and the documentation on file, including the reports and submissions from the planning authority, I am of the opinion that the directly relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines are:

- Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018).
- Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024), Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (SRDCSG), the following identified as being particularly relevant.

Section 3.2 of the Guidelines set out 'Development Management Criteria'

3.3 Settlement, Area Types and Density Ranges – 3.3.1 Cities and Metropolitan (MASP) Areas 3.4

3.4 Refining Density

4.4 Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking

5.0 Development Standards

Appendix D: Design Checklist – Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking

- Planning Design Standards for Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2025). I note that the Planning Design Standards for Apartments were published on 08.07.2025. Section 1.1 of this document states that the guidelines only apply to planning applications submitted after the publication of the guidelines. The planning application subject to the appeal was submitted on 10 February 2025 pre the issuing of the 2025 Apartment Guidelines as such the applicable guidelines are the Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities, last issued in 2023 (and all preceding updates),
- Design Manual for Quality Housing (2022)

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

Galway Bay Complex SAC Site Code:000268 and proposed Natural Heritage Area is approximately 1km south of the subject site.

Inner Galway Bay SPA Site Code:004031 is approximately 1.15km south from the subject site.

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1 Grounds of Appeal

There are three third party appeals received from the following:

- Hawthorn Place Residents Association (Maria Horkan Secretary and Cathy Donoghue Treasurer)
- Kenneth and Noelle McCarthy
- Kieran and Angela Brennan

I shall summarise each of the these appeals separately below:

- (A) Hawthorn Place Residents Association

I note that a report prepared by John M Gallagher B.E MBA (Consulting Engineers, Litigation Engineers and Town Planning) is included in support of the appeal along with Appendix A copy of objection to the proposed development on behalf of Hawthorn Place Residents Association. To avoid duplication, I shall incorporate this report into the appeal summary:

- The site does not meet the definition of a brownfield site (reference to Appendix A of the Sustainable Development and Compact Settlement, Guidelines for Planning Authorities) and cannot avail of provision for intensification under a brownfield site. The site is more suitable to a medium density instead of the high density that is proposed.
- The location of the site is a suburban area in Knocknacarra on the western periphery of Galway city centres and is not a city urban neighbourhood area. The location does not meet the definition of city urban area nor does it have planned high-capacity public transport system or reasonable local employment opportunities.
- Only limited services, education facilities/lack of school spaces and retail job opportunities can be availed of in Knocknacarra and a limited bus service to the city centre exists currently. Future additional bus connectivity is a long way off – Bus connects has been postponed for at least another 2 years.

- The site plan shows 0.313ha but only 0.272ha is zoned residential, the remaining is part of the road reserve outside the existing house site boundaries. States that it is contrary to the Galway City Council Development Plan and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area that residential development be permitted on unzoned lands and that parts of the proposed Block A and Block B be constructed on unzoned land.
- Plot ratio and density excessive. Based on lands zoned residential the density as proposed is 147 uph. Plot ratio is 1.62 to 1 on the lands zoned for residential. The requirements of section 3.4.2 Step 2 of the guidelines were ignored in the assessment.

Comparative analysis of existing density and plot ratio in the immediate environs of the subject site provided:	
Apartments on the southeast side of the roundabout planning register reference 99/494.	Site area of 0.301ha and density of 46 units per ha. Plot ratio is 0.52.
Binsin apartments north side of the Western Distributor Road	Site area of 0.5538ha and density of 54 units per ha. Plot ratio is 0.42
Altan development accessed off the next roundabout closer to Galway City on the south side of the Western Distributor Road.	Site area 1.332ha and density of 52 units per ha. Plot ratio of about 0.58.

- Consider that densities of 50 to 100 dph are open for consideration, in view of proposed improvements in accessibility, but that the complete absence of locally based employment opportunities would favour the lower figure of 35 to 50.
- Height, scale and mass of the proposed buildings fail to positively or proportionately respond/integrate with the surrounding context (predominantly two storey residential dwellings). The hotel opposite whilst three storeys have a set back from the front boundary of 15m/10m helping it to sit into the surrounding area. The proposed development protrudes beyond the established building line.

Analysis provided of the height and form of buildings within the adjacent sites provided in submission appendix prepared by John M. Gallagher. The building height and density guidelines indicate that suburban areas should feature a balanced mix of 2, 3 and 4 storey developments. Developments of 4 stories or more may be appropriate next to larger buildings, tree, parkland, rivers, sea frontage or along wider streets. The development does not meet with the Development Plan criterion that requires any increase in densities to be framed in quality architecture and adherence to good design principles.

- The proposed development will negatively affect the residential amenity of Hawthorn Place and other nearby estates in terms of overshadowing, reduction in daylight and sunlight and reduction in privacy by reason if the balconies and habitable rooms facing directly toward private amenity spaces. Recommends that Condition no. 4 be extended to require windows and private amenity space to the rear of Block B to be obscured glazing to ensure privacy against high level overlooking.
- The proposed development lacks sufficient high-quality open communal spaces. Communal open spaces cannot include parking areas, internal footpaths, unusable green space and as such when these spaces are removed the open space (two areas measuring 27mx16.5m and 17mx16m estimated at about 600sq. with a children's playground which is of limited use to persons over 12yrs and external seating provision for 9 people or thereabouts) for 154 residents is totally inadequate. The suggestion that the residents can actively walk/ jog around the pathways within the development is unrealistic as this activity would be a hazard within the site to other residents.
- There is no accessible public open space within a 10-minute walk from the site which further exacerbates the lack of amenities available.
- Concerns about significant safety issues for pedestrians, cyclists or emergency vehicles and general vehicles using the roadways around the site due to increased traffic movements.
- Under provision of car parking spaces taking into account the proposed number of residents and the lack of public transport currently. Concerns about spill over

parking in nearby residential streets and further congestion and strain on local infrastructure (disruption of services such as bin and emergency services).

- Inadequate provision of cycle parking to facilitate the number of residents. Only 30 spaces are provided, and a site of this proposed density should have at least 87 bicycle parking spaces.
- It is stated that if An Coimisiún Pleanála is disposed to grant permission for an apartment development on this site it is suggested that the appropriate density of development should be in the 60 – 80 dph range with the area of development limited to no more than 2000sq.m and plot ratio of 0.66. Height should be limited to 3-4 storeys. Car parking spaces should be provided at the rate of at least 1 per apartment with 5 additional spaces for visitors and parking for people with disabilities.

- (B) Kenneth and Noelle McCarthy

The appellants stress concerns about the impact of the development on their family, neighbours in Hawthorn Place and the surrounding community. Particular concerns include the overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking impacts from the two proposed blocks on their back garden.

- Height, Scale and Mass: The site is not suitable for such a high-density development and the proposal including the layout, design and provision of spaces does not meet the requirements set out in the Galway City Council Development Plan 2023-2029. The height as proposed is out of keeping with the established residential area and does not sufficiently take into account consideration of character, amenity and the natural environment (Sustainable Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines).
- The buildings would overshadow, fundamentally changing the way they live and enjoy their home, and destroy the amenity of the south facing back garden. Contend that the shadow analysis is inaccurate and request that an independent and comprehensive assessment be carried out, to capture the actual impact on their property and neighbouring dwellings. Photographs included to illustrate how invasive the proposed blocks would be.

- Insufficient car parking provision on site and concerns that the neighbouring estates would become overflow car parks for this development, with subsequent issues relating to congestion and hindering access/egress of waste services, deliveries and emergency services.
- Insufficient provision of quality open spaces proposed, inadequate for sustainable living. There are proposed small 'scraps of space' around the site without the necessary area required for proper active play. A small playground and a table tennis space for teenagers won't hold interest in the long term.
- The congested and increased road usage, with the number of entrances and exits within a few meters of the access location to the site with bus stop and zebra crossings make this area of Clybaun Road a dangerous road junction. Concerns about vehicles turning right onto Clybaun Road causing obstruction. The Road Safety Audit reports 14 safety concerns which are not sufficiently addressed in the application.

- (C) Kieran and Angela Brennan

I note that report prepared by John M. Gallagher (dated March 2025) prepared on behalf of Hawthorn Residents Association in association with Kieran Brennan in support of the appeal (points raised have been considered and summarised already in appeal summary (A) above). The appellant highlights their concerns with consideration of privacy and shadow analysis undertaken.

- The proposal has an excessive and inappropriate scale which is out of context with the surrounding development (Reference to considerations of character amenity and the natural environment guidance contained in the Sustainable Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities). Detailed impact statements should be requested to justify and satisfy all relevant concerns.
- Privacy will be directly and substantially impacted by the north facing balconies and windows of Block B of which there are 8 in total above ground floor level with adjacent living area windows. Furthermore, the total number of separate viewing points from both blocks into the rear garden include 48 no. windows from private dwellings, 18 balconies (some obscured due to condition no.4) and five windows from public stairwells at the rear of block A or in total up to 71 separate viewing

points. The condition no. 4 does not obscure the ability of residences of the balconies of Block B to have full and unhindered views from the fronts of their balconies directly into my rear garden and rear gardens of nos. 1-3 Hawthorn Place.

- Concerns about the apartments being used for short-term letting with associated noise and nuisance.
- The proposed development does not respond in a positive way to the existing developments due to the height of circa 25m looming over traditional two storey dwellings.
- While the proposal may meet the minimum requirements of separation between the two proposed apartment blocks there has been scant consideration for the existing surrounding housing developments and is therefore not meeting the criteria of the Sustainable Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines.
- The proposed car parking in no way would meet the real requirements for such a large development. It shall result in additional cars parked within the public areas and also within existing neighbouring residential carparking areas. A detailed traffic/car parking report should be prepared to justify this inadequate provision.
- The height and mass of Block A (24.55m) and Block B (20.35m) would result in a significant loss of daylight and create an overshadowing of the private amenity areas. At a minimum a full technical assessment of daylight performance should be requested in accordance with the relevant guidelines. Major issues with the major anomalies with the contents of the shadow analysis document and the assertions drawn from its contents are in complete contradiction of the shadow cast pictures displayed. Examples of inconsistencies set out in respect of the shadow cast and different conclusions from those presented i.e. shadow encroachment of 10m into the rear garden area of no. 3 Hawthorn Place whilst the appellant's calculations would cast a 20m shadow cast into the rear garden and onto the rear of the house on March 21st. Block A and Block B are up to 3 times the height of the 4 properties (no. 1-4 Hawthorn Place) and it is considered that shadows would be thrown across the road and potentially affect numerous solar panels recently installed on a number of these houses. It is stated that

similar castings produced independently would invariably produce very different shadow analysis.

- The boundary wall to the rear of no. 3 Hawthorn Place is incorrectly recessed on all drawings. Ordnance survey map and Land Direct website map attached but to show the true boundary between these two sites¹. Suggests that the true boundary between the site and house numbers 1-5 Hawthorn Place is incorrectly shown on the application. The true line of the boundary wall may impinge on one of the proposed electric vehicles charging points parking places and the intended turning circle.
- The entrance to this site is at a particularly busy point Clybaun Road, high degree of traffic congestion and a location which is accident prone.
- A development more appropriate to its environment, surroundings and existing mature community is what is needed in this instance.

7.2 Applicant Response

The applicant has submitted a response prepared by *Environplan Consulting Limited* to the third-party appeals.

I highlight that there is a note in section 1.0 of the submitted response to appeal that requests the third-party appeal from Kenneth and Noelle McCarthy to be dismissed as invalid as they state no formal acknowledgment of the original submission from the Planning Authority was included. This is incorrect and a copy of the submission acknowledgements, for submission made in March 2025 and subsequent submission made in February 2026 following response to further information, are included and is attached to the case file as submitted with the appeal.

In summary the response states:

- They consider that the subject site can rightfully be described as a serviced 'brownfield' and 'infill' site within Galway City having regard to the definition for Brownfield included in Appendix A of the Sustainable Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities'.

¹ Mapping not available on the case file.

- The Galway City Development Plan (CDP) does not identify the ‘unzoned’ strip of land as a road reserve and a Part 8 planning permission was recently approved along the southern edge of the site for the ‘Galway Western Distributor Road (WDR) Cycle scheme with no conflicts identified. Both the cycle scheme and the residential development along the WDR can be delivered. Given the subject strip of land is unzoned the proposal for part of the development to be located within the strip would not constitute a material contravention.
- There is no policy to retain the existing building line along the Western Distributor Road at this location, and the CDP does not designate this strip as road reserve. Noting that the building directly across from the site projects forward of the adjoining ‘Gort Suir’ Housing estate.
- The proposed building height at this location is justifiable having regard to the planning history, the node/interchange location, the provisions of the Galway Building Heights Study /CDP as well as the Building Height Guidelines. Highlights that the overall height of the proposed 6 storey building (Block A) is 23.5m and this is only marginally higher than the highest point of the permitted building on site (Planning register reference 19/177). Note assessment of the proposed scheme against section 3.2 of the Guidelines set out ‘Development Management Criteria’.
- Separation distances of >26m between the northern building line of Block A (with upper floor balconies and fenestration) and the existing rear building line of No. 1 Hawthorn Place. Block B (with upper floor balconies and fenestration) has a proposed separation of >25m to the existing rear building line of no. 3 Hawthorn Place. A separation of >24m between the northern building line of Block B and the existing rear building line of No. 4 Hawthorn Place. As such, in compliance with the provisions of SPPR 1 the Sustainable Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines’. Throughout the comprehensive planning history, the principle of upper floor windows along the northern elevation has been permitted (Planning register reference no. 19/177-ABP 307595).
- Refers to letter prepared by Realsim authors of the submitted Shadow Analysis which defends the findings of the report (Appendix 2 of submission).
- In terms of demonstrating inconsistency in scale by referring to the other existing apartment developments it is considered that ‘Altan’ and ‘Binsin’ were of a time and permitted long before the publication of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

- The subject site constitutes a 'Strategic and Sustainable Development Location' by reason of its proximity to the hotel, future parkland, schools, district centre/employment centre and a neighbourhood centre. In addition, the subject site is located along a planned high-capacity public transport node/interchange under the provisions of the GTS and Bus Connects. Refer to the Galway BusConnects Network Map indicates that the subject site is located along the western interchange of a planned 10-12 min high frequency route. Figure 3.1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines used to illustrate low rise apartments of density range between 100-150dph and states that the subject site sits comfortably within this range.
- The unzoned strip of land is not part of a major road/street, is not a way leave/right of way and is not an area of environmental or topographical constraint as such the inclusion of this area as part of the net area of the site is not precluded.
- The principle of the proposed car parking provision is fully supported by the planning authority's decision.
- The claim that additional school places are not available is subjective and not substantiated. Owing the to modest quantum of units proposed a school capacity assessment is not warranted in this case.
- Issues with respect to the boundary wall incorrectly indicated the red line extent along the northern boundary is the same as that proposed and permitted as part of the long established planning history on site. Cross refers to submitted solicitor's letter, 'as existing' site survey dating back to 2004, and section 5.13 of the Development Management Guidelines i.e. Issues relating to title of land. The parties involved can have resource to the Courts to settles any such question of boundary delineation.
- The area of communal open space provision inclusive of usable green areas and internal pathways excluding parking areas amount to 1129sq.m or 36% of the site area. These areas consist of generously proportioned, usable, well supervised and well-designed communal open space areas.

7.3 Planning Authority Response

- None

7.4 Observations

- None

8.0 Assessment

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

- Zoning
- Height, scale and design
- Residential Amenity (overshadowing and overlooking)
- Traffic impacts
- Others

8.1 Zoning

The subject site is located in the neighbourhood of Knocknacarra within the development plan defined 'outer suburbs'. The site is zoned R Residential with a section of the site alongside the Western Distributor Road indicated as unzoned land. The unzoned section of the site sits to the south and west of the existing boundary of the detached property, which is proposed to be demolished.

The portion of unzoned land is not designated as road reserve in the current Galway City Development Plan, and I note that the report received from Galway City Active Travel section confirms that "...*the proposed development does not interfere with the proposed active travel project on the Western Distributor Road*". As such, I would concur with the applicant that the proposed development of the apartment scheme on this portion of unzoned lands can be considered against the other planning objectives and policies within the development plan.

From my site inspection I note the large number of mature trees immediately adjacent to the existing stonewall southern boundary of the subject site which appear to be removed to accommodate the development. The submitted revised landscape plan indicates tree planting of 15 no. trees and 1 no. multi-stemmed tree. In the event the Commission is

mindful to grant permission a condition could be attached requiring the retention and integration of existing trees and hedgerows, where possible, on the development site and agree appropriate tree planting, as part of landscaping schemes for new developments in accordance with Policy 5.4 Green Spaces: Urban Woodlands and Trees of the development plan.

8.2 Height, scale and design

Taking into account the appellants common concerns with respect to the height, scale and design of the proposed development I shall assess the proposed development using the 'Design Checklist – Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking' (as set out in the Sustainable Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines for Planning Authorities (SDCSG)) to determine its acceptability from a design perspective. For clarity I note that the development plan refers to the Sustainable Residential Developments in Urban Areas Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2009) which has been revoked and replaced by the SDCSG.

- Sustainable and Efficient Movement

Given the nature of the corner site and its limited area no links to adjoining residential estates are expected. I note the proposed three no. pedestrian/cycle entrances and their connections to the blocks allowing for efficient movement between the proposed development and connections with both the existing cycle network and bus routes. Site access for pedestrians and cyclists has been designed in accordance with the National Cycle Manual (NCM) as stated in the report prepared by *D.Fallon Consulting Engineers* and the internal access routes are stated to comply with DMURS.

As noted in section 7.0 of my report the appellant raises concerns that the quantum of parking has been minimised to a level that would result in overspill parking within adjoining residential estates and have also raised concerns with respect to the safety of the proposed vehicular entrance. I shall address this issue separately in section 8.4 of my report.

- Mix of land uses (vibrant centres and communities)

The proposed residential scheme has included a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed roomed apartments with the largest percentage of 2 bedroom (4 person and 3 person typology) which would in my opinion positively contribute to the dwelling typologies available in the neighbourhood. The

apartment sizes and proposed provision of private open space has been demonstrated to comply with the Apartment Guidelines.

- Green and Blue Infrastructure (Open space, landscape and heritage)

The proposed development does not include any provision for public open space; I note that the Recreation & Amenity (Parks) section indicate that the applicant should be conditioned to provide a financial contribution within the terms of Section 48 in lieu of the provision within the application site. Condition no. 22 of the planning authority's decision relates to the payment of a financial contribution.

As already noted in my report the development proposal would result in the loss of a number of mature trees along the southern and eastern boundary, which currently provide a soft buffer to the Western Distributor Road and Binsin apartments. I am of the view that the landscape scheme should be revised to include for the retention of some of the existing trees to facilitate the integration of the new buildings, this matter can be addressed by condition.

The proposed communal open space, as described in the submitted Landscape Design Statement, comprises principally three spaces including a grassed area, a playground for younger children and a teenager amenity space. The appellants raise concerns that the quantum of open space is not sufficient for the future residents. The communal space is stated to be 1129 sq.m or 36% of the site area as per drawing no. 23026.PL.300 'Block A & Block B Proposed Site Layout Plan'. I would not agree with the inclusion of the footpath and incidental areas at the entrances to the blocks as part of the communal open space calculation. Appendix 1 of the Planning Design Standards for Apartment Guidelines sets out the minimum recommended floor areas for communal amenity space per apartment type. In the subject application I calculate there is a requirement for a minimum of 283sq.m based on the proposed mix of apartment units. From my calculation of the central communal area, conservatively excluding pathways and the landscaped semi-private open space section fronting onto the Clybaun Road would, at approximately 650 sq. m, exceed the minimum requirement of the Apartment Guidelines and represents 20% of the total site area which exceeds the minimum rate of 15% required under the development standards set out in section 11.3.1 (c). As such, the provision of communal open space is acceptable.

- Responsive built form

The appellants consider the height, density and scale of proposed development is excessive for its outer suburban location. In respect to the proposed density of 129 units per hectare (uph), the applicants consider that given the subject site is located within the designated city and suburbs area located along the western interchange of a planned '10-12 min' high frequency route would place it within the High-Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange category as per Table 3.8 of the SDCSGs allowing for densities in the range of 50dph to 200 dph. I do not concur with the applicant's interpretation of what category the site would fall within as it appears they have based this interpretation on the draft Bus Network Mapping that issued for public consultation in April 2023 and this mapping was modified in response to the consultations. Having checked the latest bus connects map for Galway (dated April 2026 accessed on 15/06/2026 at <https://busconnects.ie/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/Galway-Bus-Network-Map.pdf>) it indicates that the Gateway Shopping Park, further east of the subject site, will be the point at which there is a planned route frequency of 7.5 to 10 mins. As this area is within 500m walking distance of the subject site I am of the view that the site falls within the 'Accessible Location' category of Table 3.8 rather than High-Capacity Public Transport Node or Interchange Category. The resultant density range, as per Table 3.2 of the SDCSGs would be taking into account the 'accessible' suburban location, up to 100 dph. As such, the proposed density exceeds the 'open for consideration' density within the SDCSGs of 100dph. There are interlinked issues arising with the increased density proposed on this outer suburban location. I shall address the implications in terms of height in the subsequent section and also address separately the proposed provision of car parking in section 8.4 of my report.

The subject site is a prominent corner location on the Western Distributor Road and the Clybaun Road. Currently the existing buildings sit off the roadway edge with generous setbacks and landscape screening. The Clybaun Hotel positioned on a higher ground level than the subject site creates a landmark feature, notwithstanding, that this building is only three storeys. From my site visit and visit of the wider environs of the site I note that the recently constructed Lidl at a similar corner location (Bóthar Stiofain/Western Distributor Road) projects forward to the road edge with an overall height of 11.2m. This structure, whilst not residential in use, provides a helpful example of the likely visual impact of bringing the building line forward.

The proposed blocks stepping forward of the established building line of the adjoining Binsin apartment block would in my opinion amplify their visual impact and by reason of their height (20.4m Block A and 17.25m Block B - not including the lift core) relative to size of the site and the surrounding two and three storey context and would appear visually incongruous in this outer suburban location.

The Galway City Urban Density and Building Height Study (GCUDBH) development guidance states that key junctions and nodes of activities present opportunities for more urban enclosure with 3-4 storey development. As highlighted by the applicant in their response to the appeals section 8.8 of the development plan states that "*These suggested ranges of scale and intensity are a guide and are not absolute measures to be pursued or achieved and each site should be considered on its merits*" and that "densities and heights lower or higher than those outlined in the study may be appropriate when assessed against other relevant policy and guidance". As such, taking into account the site is not of scale capable of generating its own character but acknowledging the previous permission for a part five storey in height mixed use development (Planning register reference 19177 (ABP-307595-20)), I am of the view that the proposed blocks A and B should be reduced in height by one floor in response to the prevailing low scaled context. The reduction in both blocks by one floor would reduce the total number of apartments to 32 no. and the density would be reduced to approximately 103 uph more or less aligning with the density considered open for consideration at an accessible location within the SDCSGs. In the event that the Commission is minded to grant permission it is recommended that this issue can be addressed by condition omitting the third floor of both Block A and Block B.

In terms of the layout and the orientation of the two proposed blocks provide a communal open space running centrally on a north south axis. Access to daylight and sunlight for the proposed blocks has been demonstrated to comply with daylight factors and the interior sunlight results show that 40 out of 40 proposed units would receive a sufficient amount of sunlight within at least one habitable room, with a pass rate of 100%.

8.3 Residential Amenity (Privacy, overshadowing, noise)

Privacy

In respect to potential impact on privacy as a result of overlooking from windows and balconies I do agree with the appellants that the proposed development would have an

impact on their sense of privacy given it would result in a discernible change to their current outlook. The development plan sets out, in section 11.3.1 (d) 'Overlooking', that in the case of developments exceeding 2 storeys in height a greater distance than 11m may be required from existing private open space. The proposed positioning of Block B is within 10metres of the private rear gardens of Hawthorn Place and as such does not meet this development standard. Notwithstanding, I note that the proposed separation distances between the existing houses along Hawthorn Place exceed 16 metres between opposing windows in accordance with SPPR 1 of the Specific Planning Policy Requirement (SPPR) of the SDCSGs. Therefore, in applying this SPPR to the current proposal I consider that, subject to a condition requiring the installation of opaque glazed privacy screen to the balconies located on the northern elevation, overlooking would not be so detrimental to the existing residential amenity to justify a refusal on this basis.

Overshadowing

The appellants Kieran and Angela Brennan have identified inaccuracies in the submitted shadow analysis and have submitted their own calculation of likely shadow impact from the proposed development. The applicant has submitted a clarification submission from the consultants (*Realsim*) responsible for the preparation of the shadow analysis report. It is accepted by Realsim that the report has a number of errors as highlighted by the appellant, they state that these are editing errors. Realsim state that they refer in error to a September Equinox analysis when Spring Equinox shadows are presented. It is stated that this error does not materially change the analysis as the shadows are the same for both, which it is argued by the consultants the only difference being an hour shift due to daylight savings and greater shadows from surrounding vegetation which by and large are still in leaf in September. Both the Spring and Autumn Equinox shadows are illustrated in Figure 3 and Figure 4 of the clarification submission. In addition, a new figure (Figure 5) for shadows cast in June at 3pm for the proposed development has been submitted to replace the incorrect insertion of the March 21 at 3pm. These corrections are noted in conjunction with the ground truth evidence of simulated shadow accuracy provided by Realsim. On the basis of the amending information, I consider that it has been demonstrated that the shadow encroachment of the proposed development on the gardens of the impacted properties complies with the minimum BRE light and shadow recommendations. As a result the level of overshadowing should not be so significant as to justify a refusal of permission on this basis. Taking into consideration my recommendation to reduce the

height of both blocks by one floor I am of the opinion that a subsequent further reduction in shadow encroachment on the rear gardens would occur.

Noise

The concerns raised in respect to the proposed apartments being used for short-term letting an associated noise and nuisance can be addressed by condition addressing the management of the proposed blocks and also to limit the use for short-term letting as per the planning authority's condition no. 6.

8.4 Traffic impacts and road safety (including parking overspill issues)

The proposed development provides for 24 no. car parking spaces to serve the 40 no. proposed apartments, in conjunction with 48 no. double stacked bicycle parking spaces in Block A, 40 no. double stacked bicycle parking spaces in Block B with 10 'Sheffield' type bicycle standards for visitors (space for 20 bicycles) and a universal design vehicle storage (Cargo bike storage).

The submitted Traffic and Transport Assessment (TTA) tests two scenarios of the proposed Clybaun Road/Clybaun Hotel/Development Access junction with the development and the Athy Roundabout (Western Distributor Road/Clybaun Road Junction) without and with the development. In summary the TTA (Table 3.3) demonstrates that the proposed Clybaun Road/Clybaun Hotel/Development Access junction will operate with a large amount of spare capacity and minimal queuing, having 95% spare capacity in the 2042 AM peak hour and 96% spare capacity in the 2042 PM peak hour. Table 3.4 of the TTA illustrates that the impact of the proposed development on the Athy Roundabout would be negligible and that the proposed development through to 2042 has a maximum impact on the RFC (Ratio of Flow to Capacity) of 1% with the current Athy Roundabout having spare capacity for the development through to 2042. The TTA does note however that if pedestrian crossing movements at the zebra crossing associated with the roundabout increase the occurrence of vehicle blocking back onto the circulatory area of the roundabout would also correspondingly increase. I am of the opinion that the proposed residential scheme would not significantly increase the level of pedestrian crossings to such an extent that would result in a significant impact on the operation of the roundabout given the spare capacity identified. As such, I am of the view that the proposed development would not result in a negative impact on traffic movements in the area.

The appellants are concerned that the reduced car parking provision at this location would lead to overspill parking occurring in the adjoining estate. As already stated above I consider the subject site to fall within an accessible outer suburban location and not one that is situated at a planned high-capacity public transport corridor. As such, the level of reduction in parking should be proportional to the site's outer suburban location. The reduced parking is a direct result of the small nature of the site and the proposed density of dwellings. I am of the opinion that the proposed blocks should be reduced by one floor in height, as set out in my assessment in section 8.2 above, and that this would result in a total of 32 no. apartments. Such a reduction would provide a more appropriate ratio of car parking provision per dwelling in line with SPPR3- Car Parking of the SDCDGs.

The submitted Stage 1 Road Safety Audit prepared by TTRSA states that the existing central hatch road marking extending northwards from the Athy Roundabout would be revised to provide a right turn lane for the proposed development site access junction and that the existing right turn land for the Clybaun Hotel access will be retained. The problems identified with the scheme within the Stage 1 RSA and associated recommendations have been accepted by the design team (Please refer to Appendix B – Road Safety Audit Feedback Form). I note that the revision undertaken in response to the further information request has addressed the issues raised in respect to vehicle and pedestrian/cyclist conflicts in revised drawing 'Block A & Block B Proposed Site Layout Plan' DRWG No. 23026.PL.300 prepared by Urban Arq and appropriate access and manoeuvrability for refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles, as illustrated in the Autotrack Analysis Drawing provided (DWG G2321DG0060-02 Rev P05). In respect to other recommendations made at Stage 1 I am of the opinion that these measures can be agreed by condition required a Stage 2 and implemented at Stage 3 RSA. In the event the Commission is minded to grant permission I recommend that a condition is attached in this respect.

8.5 Others

In respect to issues raised with respect to the exact position of the northern boundary to the rear of no. 3 Hawthorn Place I note the appellants concerns. In terms of the legal interest, I am satisfied that the applicants have provided sufficient evidence of their legal intent to make an application. Any further legal dispute is considered a Civil matter and are outside the scope of the planning appeal. In any case, this is a matter to be

resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.

The appellants have raised concerns about the adequacy of social infrastructure in the area, such as schools, GP practices, and also proximate employment opportunities. I am of the opinion that the scale of the proposed development is not of such significance that would materially or significantly impact on the social infrastructure in place and given the sites accessible location consider there to be appropriate active travel/public travel routes available to future occupants.

9.0 AA Screening

Please refer also to Appendix 3.

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site(s) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration.

Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

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

10.0 Water Framework Directive

An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the subject site's outer suburban location within Galway City and Suburbs, the vacant brownfield nature of the site, and its accessible location positioned adjacent to the Western Distributor Road the proposed development, subject to condition, would not adversely impact on the adjoining residential amenities and would meet the objective for efficient and effective use of land and make a positive contribution to the character and liveability of the city. The proposed development, is therefore, 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 22 day of December 2025 (revised public notices received 22/01/2026), 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 proposed development shall be amended as follows:
 - a. The height of the proposed apartment blocks (Block A and Block B) shall be reduced by one floor, omitting the third-floor level 4 no. apartments in Block A (Apartment Nos, 11, 12, 13 and 14) and 4 no. apartments in Block B (Apartment Nos 33, 34, 35 and 36). In the interest of clarity this permission is for 32 no. apartments only.
 - b. Opaque privacy screens shall be provided to the balconies serving the proposed apartments on the northern elevations facing the existing properties in Hawthorn Place.

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

Reason: In the interests of orderly development and residential amenity.

3. The residential units shall not be used for short term lettings as defined in the Residential Tenancies (Amendment) Act 2019 and the Planning and Development Act 2000 (Exempted Development) (No. 2) Regulations 2019.

Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. The car parking spaces provided within the development shall be reserved for exclusive use of the residential occupiers of the development.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.

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

7. The developer shall undertake full road width realignment on the section of the Clybaun Road, which the development fronts onto. Exact details shall be submitted to the Planning Authority for written approval prior to the commencement of development. The developer shall submit an undertaking that the additional width on the Clybaun Road shall form part of the public road system under the charge of the Local Authority.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and the proper planning and sustainable development.

8. All accepted recommendations set out in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit shall be implemented by the developer. Prior to the construction of the development a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit shall be undertaken and on completion of the development, a stage 3 road safety audit shall be completed by an independent road safety auditor, at the developer's expense, and submitted for the written approval of the planning authority. Any safety issues highlighted in the audit shall be reviewed and addressed by the developer at their expense.

Reason: In the interest of road safety.

9. (a) An accurate tree survey of the site, which shall be carried out by an arborist or landscape architect, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The survey shall show the location of each tree on the site, together with the species, height, girth, crown spread and condition of each tree, distinguishing between those which it is proposed to be felled and those which it is proposed to be retained.
(b) Measures for the protection of those trees which it is proposed to be retained shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority before any

trees are felled.

Reason: To facilitate the identification and subsequent protection of trees to be retained on the site in accordance with Policy 5.4 Green Spaces: Urban Woodlands and Trees of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029.

10. (a) Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall retain the professional services of a qualified Landscape Architect throughout the life of the site development works.
- (b) A professional prepared plan for the play area/recreational facility, along with exact details for the recreational play area/facility shall be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of development with the Planning Authority. The appointed person shall submit a report of certification upon completion of the play area/recreational facility to the Planning Authority which shall be agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.
- (c) The Landscape Architect shall submit a landscape completion record to the planning authority for written agreement, as verification that the approved landscape plans and specification have been fully implemented.

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

11. Prior to the commencement of development, a piece/s of artwork shall be provided within this development. The evolution of the design should include the creation of an aesthetic object/s, either reflecting the natural or built environment, or an abstract piece all of which should allow for the generation experiences which can be shared with others within this new community. The artwork proposed for this development shall be sponsored by the developer. The details and timeframe for its

erection shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area and to accord with the Per Cent for Art Scheme 2020 (as outlined in section 11.27 of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029).

12. Proposals for an apartment naming and numbering scheme and associated signage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, all apartment numbers, shall be provided in accordance with the agreed scheme. The proposed name(s) shall be based on local historical or topographical features, or other alternatives acceptable to the planning authority. No advertisements/marketing signage relating to the name(s) of the development shall be erected until the developer has obtained the planning authority's written agreement to the proposed name(s).

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

13. A Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. The CEMP shall include but not be limited to construction phase controls for dust, noise and vibration, waste management, protection of soils, groundwaters, and surface waters, site housekeeping, emergency response planning, site environmental policy, and project roles and responsibilities.

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

14. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these

times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

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

15. The management and maintenance of the proposed development following its completion shall be the responsibility of a legally constituted management company. A management scheme providing adequate measures for the future maintenance of public open spaces, roads and communal areas shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: To provide for the satisfactory future maintenance of this development in the interest of residential amenity.

16. 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 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.

This plan shall provide for screened communal bin stores, the locations and designs of which shall be included in the details to be submitted.

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

17. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority [in relation to the transfer of a percentage of the land, to be agreed with the planning authority, in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3)(a), (Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and/or the provision of housing on lands in accordance with the requirements of section 94(4) and section 96(2) and 96(3) (b),

(Part V) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended], unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.

18. 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.

19. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or other security to secure the provision and satisfactory completion of roads, footpaths, watermains, drains, open space and other services required in connection with the

development, coupled with an agreement empowering the local authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory completion of any part of the development. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

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

Claire McVeigh
Planning Inspector

15 June 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL500959-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	40. no apartments and all site works.
Development Address	Clybaun Road and Western Distributor Road , Knocknacarra , Galway City
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to	

<p>be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<p>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Class 10. Infrastructure projects (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>

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

Yes

No

Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL500959-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	40. no apartments and all site works.
Development Address	Clybaun Road and Western Distributor Road , Knocknacarra , Galway City
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).</p>	<p>The project due to its size and nature will not give rise to significant production of waste during both the construction and operation phases or give rise to significant risk of pollution and nuisance.</p> <p>The construction of the proposed development does not have potential to cause significant effects on the environment due to water pollution. The project characteristics pose no significant risks to human health.</p> <p>The proposed development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural</p>	<p>The subject site is located within the outer suburb area of Galway and comprises an already developed and serviced site.</p> <p>The subject site is not located in or immediately adjacent to ecologically sensitive sites.</p>

<p>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>It is considered that, having regard to the nature and scale of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effect on other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>The size of the proposed development is notably below the mandatory thresholds in respect of a Class 10 Infrastructure Projects of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended.</p> <p>There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects in the adjoining area.</p> <p>Having regard to the modest 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>

<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>EIA is not required.</p>
<p>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

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

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3: Standard AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Case Reference Number: PL-500959-GC-26	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	The proposed development comprises the demolition of the existing detached two-storey dwelling, which is set within a large private garden area, and construction of 40 no. apartments and all site works. Please refer to section 2.0 of my report for further detail.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The proposed site lies at the Junction of the Clybaun Road and Western Distributor Road, Knocknacarra, Galway City (Grid Ref: Easting: 526183.08, Northing: 724927.38) The application site lies approximately 966 meters north from the Galway Bay Complex SAC and approximately 1.1 km north from the Inner Galway Bay SPA.
Screening report	Y/N
Natura Impact Statement	Y/N
Relevant submissions	None

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

All Natura 2000 sites within a 15km buffer of the proposed development are listed in Table 3.1 and illustrated in Figure 3.5 of the submitted Appropriate Assessment Screening Report prepared by Environplan Consulting Limited.

The submitted AA Screening Report outlines that the site does not lie within a Lesser Horseshoe Bat Foraging Range. It is stated that the “*closest Lesser Horseshoe Bat Foraging Range identified to the development site is approximately 12.9 km to the northwest of the application site associated with Ross Lake and Woods SAC*”.

However, it is noted that according to surveys carried out for the N6 Galway City Ring Road, there is a Lesser Horseshoe Bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) roost (PBR116) recorded approximately 1.5 km to the west of the application site (as illustrated in Figure 3.4 of the submitted AA Screening report).

The submitted Bat Survey and Roost Inspection Report prepared by Environplan Consulting Limited did not record any Lesser Horseshoe passes. Whilst the tree lines at the south, east and western boundary of the site are considered to be suitable foraging habitats for bats, it is stated in the report that there are no suitable ecological corridors connecting to this site and existing light levels are high in the area given the urban environment which is not suitable for bat species and no impacts are predicted in this regard.

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
Galway Bay Complex SAC Site	https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/sac/000268 (Conservation Objectives dated 16 April 2013)	0.966km	There are no identifiable ecological and hydrological	N

Code:0002 68			connector/receptor pathways between this site and the Natura 2000 site.	
Inner Galway Bay SPA Site Code:0040 31	https://www.npws.ie/protected-sites/spa/004031 (Conservation Objectives dated 1 May 2013)	1.1km	There are no identifiable ecological and hydrological connector/receptor pathways between this site and the Natura 2000 site.	N

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

	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y/N
	If no, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No

*Where a restore objective applies it is necessary to consider whether the project might compromise the objective of restoration or make restoration more difficult.

Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site
<p>I conclude that the proposed development alone would not result in likely significant effects on any European site(s). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>
Screening Determination
Finding of no likely significant effects
<p>In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site(s) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration.</p> <p>Appropriate Assessment is not required.</p> <p>This determination is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nature of works• Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections