



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501115-RN-26

Development	Demolition of existing structure and construction of two semi detached two storey houses.
Location	Station View , Castlerea , Co. Roscommon
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660020
Applicant(s)	Paul & Julie Colleran
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Paul & Julie Colleran
Observer(s)	Bernadette Mannion
Date of Site Inspection	03 June 2026
Inspector	Sandra Eapen

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
6.0 EIA Screening.....	8
7.0 The Appeal	8
5. 1 Planning Authority Response.....	10
5. 2 Observations.....	10
8.0 Assessment	10
9.0 AA Screening.....	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	16
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	18
Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination.....	21

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The appeal is made in relation to a corner site measuring c.0.0636ha along Church Road, and located within Castlerea Town, Roscommon. The site is largely flat, bound by 1m tall masonry walls along Church Road and currently only contains a single storey, block shed measuring c.19sqm. The site directly addresses the side elevation of an existing warehouse type buildings to its side and to its north fronts onto Station View Road which is a cul-de-sac serving limited number of 2 storey semi-detached houses. On street parking is provided for the existing residents here. The subject site is located within 100m of Castlerea train station.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission was sought for the following works

- Construction of 2 no. semi-detached, 2 storey dwelling, 218sqm in total and associated private open spaces, and boundary treatments. The two semi-detached dwellings would have a combined hipped roof at a ridge height of 7.947m.
- The dwellings front onto and are accessed via Station View Road with 1 no. in-curtilage parking space provided to each dwelling.
- Demolition of existing single storey structure 19sqm

Ancillary site works and connection to services

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority's decision dated 09 March 2026 refused permission for the proposed development for 1 no refusal reason:

Refusal Reason No. 1

The proposed development by reason of its design, which is not considered a sufficiently responsive built form in the context of the established pattern and form of development in the immediate vicinity, would not meet the required standard of urban placemaking, would not provide a high-quality residential environment and

would impact unduly on the residential amenity of existing and future residents, if permitted. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Section 4.4 of “Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements - Guidelines for Planning Authorities” (DHLGH; 2024), and Sections 12.6 (Residential Development – Urban) and 12.16 (Urban Streetscape and Character) of Volume 1 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

The Planning Report (dated 09 March 2026) is the basis for the refusal decision. The report notes the following with regard to the proposed development:

- Site is zoned as “Existing Residential” as per the Development Plan and acknowledges the opportunities for infill sites as noted in section 4.10 and Objective TV 4.19 of the Development Plan.
- As per the land use matrix for Castlerea town, multi-unit residential development is open for consideration.
- The report acknowledges that the site is not laid out as a communal open space.
- The design solution proposed is not considered to be a satisfactory response in the context of the established pattern and form of development in the site vicinity.
- The proposed design does not reflect the configuration of the site, the two street edges, established scale, urban grain and existing pattern of residential development.
- The design would not meet the required standard for urban placemaking for high quality residential development and would impact residential amenity of existing/future residents contrary to Section 4.4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines, 2024.
- Public main connections are being proposed to service the development. UÉ had required conditions under previous application.

- The report notes that the applicant has secured a Part V exemption certificate for the proposed development.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **Roads Section:** No objection noted. The report from Roads Section notes no concern with regard to traffic safety based on the information submitted. General conditions were recommended.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

1 no. observation was made at planning application stage by the Observer. The concerns raised are reflected in the Appeal Observations section of this report.

4.0 Planning History

- ACP-323423-25 (Reg. Ref. 2560014) Permission **refused** on appeal for the construction of 2 no. semi-detached dwellings and demolition of existing shed. Refusal reasons state the deficiencies in the quality and layout of private amenity space and inadequate sightlines from the proposed access onto Church Road.
- Reg. Ref. 2360297 Permission **refused** for the construction of 2 no. semi-detached dwellings and retention of existing structure as a domestic garage. Reason for refusal related to unresponsive built form to the pattern of development that would not meet the required standard of urban placemaking, would not provide a high-quality residential environment and would impact unduly on the residential amenity of existing and future residents.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028

The site is designated as Existing Residential land use zoning in the Roscommon County Development Plan, 2022-28. Provision of single residential unit developments are denoted as acceptable in principle and multi-unit residential

developments are denoted as open for consideration for existing residential zoning within Table CA1 Castlerea Land Use Zoning Matrix.

Chapter 2 Core Strategy and Settlement Policy

Castlerea is recognised as a self-sustaining town within the Development Plan with a population of less than 2000. Population growth envisaged for the plan period is 354 or 19%. Proposed densities of 20uph.

CS 2.15 Seeks to ensure towns such as Castlerea to be maintained as an important local service centre.

Chapter 4 Towns and Villages

Section 4.10 Infill and Brownfield Sites

TV 4.19 Encourages appropriate development of infill sites

Chapter 7 Infrastructure, Transport and Communications

ITC 7.1 Supports development of compact settlements on sites served by public transport.

ITC 7.40 Encourages new developments to connect to public wastewater infrastructure

Chapter 12 Development Management Standards

Section 12.2 Compliance with Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines

Section 12.6 Residential Development (Urban) – requires ‘all developments to present to a high quality and considering design solutions employing best practice standards’ -The Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009, associated Best Practice Urban Design Manual, 2009.

Section 12.16 Urban Character and Streetscape – sets out design considerations for urban and village design. Developments should achieve coherent design solution, respect existing streetscape and built heritage, adequate servicing and traffic management considerations.

Section 12.24 Roads and Transportation

Table 12.1 Car parking standards

Table 12.2 Bicycle parking standards

Appendix 4 Wastewater treatment Capacity -Castlerea is noted to have adequate capacity for anticipated population growth. A headroom of 2960 is indicated in the Development Plan.

Settlement Plan for Castlerea is provided within Section 2 of Volume 2 of the Development Plan. It supports the appropriate development of brownfield and back land sites subject to normal planning considerations.

GPO 6 Promotes regeneration of existing town footprint by better utilising lands.

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

Section 4.4 Key Indicators of Quality Design and Placemaking- (v) Responsive Built Form

Table 3.6 Areas and Density Ranges for Small to Medium Sized Towns (1,500 – 5,000 population) - Town Edge: Density range of 25 dph to 40 dph (net)

SPPR 1 - Separation Distances – 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses. Below 26m may be considered where there are no opposing windows and where suitable privacy measures are designed.

SPPR 2 - Minimum Private Open Space Standards for House - 3 bed house 40 sq.m
For urban infill schemes on smaller sites (e.g. sites of up to 0.25ha) the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space.

SPPR 3 – Car Parking - In intermediate and peripheral locations, the maximum rate of car parking provision shall be 2 no. spaces per dwelling.

5.3. Ministerial Guidelines: Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities – Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes Sustaining Communities (2007)

Section 5.3.2, Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 sets out the space requirements and room sizes for dwellings.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within any designated European sites. Cloonchambers Bog SAC and NHA is located 3.4km east of subject site. Corliskea/Trien/Cloonfelliv Bog SAC and NHA is located 3.9km south of 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

This is a first party appeal against the decision to refuse permission issued by the Planning Authority. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Refusal reason does not reflect any fundamental issues with the development and only reflects matter of design interpretation, not supported by objective analysis
- Principle of development is accepted on subject site – Residential zoned site, within town boundary
- Previous refusal on site related to design, layout and road safety concerns. This has been addressed in the current application – dual frontage, site access revised, private open space has been defined, setback increased, boundary treatment
- Proposal represents a considered balanced response to corner site location.

- Both houses were designed as a single entity to high standard of residential amenity.
- Site has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development and appropriate levels of private amenity
- Surrounding area has varied dwelling types, irregular building lines/ setbacks and absence of rigid urban grain.
- Roads Section had no objection to the proposed development – compliant sight lines, improved access arrangements.
- Street edge definition has been addressed through building frontage, boundary treatment, soft landscaping addressing the visibility requirements.
- The proposed design appropriately differentiates between primary and secondary street frontages- providing active and engaged residential while not compromising road safety requirements.
- No evidence to support adverse residential amenity alleged. Dwellings are provided with 100sqm and 60 sqm private open space exceeding min. standards.
- Alternate orientations have been considered – given the irregular nature of the site the proposed arrangement is the most appropriate, preserves strong frontage along Station View, reduced overlooking issues
- Appendix C of the appeal grounds include a photographic assessment of site and streetscape.
- Design is not overly complex and is derived from the prevailing architectural language of the area- respecting the established character of Church Street and Station View.
- Church Street function as a mixed-use corridor rather than a uniform residential street setting.
- Existing built form along Church Street is defined by gable fronted elevations - presenting clean side elevations along streetscape, minimal setback behind low boundary walls, rendered finishes

5.1 Planning Authority Response

None on file

5.2 Observations

1 no. observation was made in relation to the subject appeal by a third party. The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:

- The existing residential development along Station View had 13 no. dwellings with gardens to the front across the road – development will result in safety issues to residents using their gardens across the street
- The development will cause additional traffic congestion on a narrow road where there is already severe parking constraints with many families having 2 no. cars.
- The site is currently being used for parking by houses No.s 1 and 2 Station View
- The two houses will obstruct daylight and cause loss of privacy for dwellings across the street.
- Development will obstruct traffic entering the cul-de-sac from Church Road- a busy road.
- Fourth or fifth planning application on subject site for new dwellings.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Design and Layout
- Residential Amenity Provided
- Overlooking, Overshadowing Impacts

- Traffic Safety
- Conclusion

8.2. Principle of Development

8.2.1. The subject site is located within the settlement boundary of Castlerea town, on lands designated as 'Existing Residential'. The Castlerea land use zoning matrix under its Settlement Plan categorises multi-unit residential development as open for consideration at this location. The Development Plan promotes compact developments of towns and supports new infill developments on sites located within the built up area of towns. The principle of development is therefore acceptable, subject to the detailed considerations below. There are no concerns regarding the proposed demolition of existing single storey structure (19sqm) on site.

8.3. Design and Layout

8.3.1. The applicant has made some changes to the layout to address the previous refusal (Ref. ACP-323423-25). In the current application the two dwellings have been pushed further north to increase the setback along Church Road. The new design has also revised the car parking provision to 1 no. per dwelling, provided to the side of the dwellings and as accessed from Station View Road. The dwellings are designed to address Station View Road. Private amenity space for both dwellings is provided to the rear of the dwelling. A second boundary (timber fence 1.8m high) is proposed to the side of the proposed rear garden for the corner dwelling to provide increased privacy from the street. The floor plan arrangement is identical to what was proposed previously. The 2 no. semi-detached dwellings are proposed to have a combined hipped roof design with a ridge height of c.7.947m.

8.3.2. The refusal reason stated by the Planning Authority specifically notes insufficient design response to the established pattern of development and noncompliance with urban placemaking standards. Most of the existing dwellings along the west side of Church Road front directly onto the internal roads and have semi-private/communal gardens opposite to the dwellings, across the road. The appeal observation received also notes that the sites once served as amenity space for dwellings along Station View. The Planning Authority in their assessment considered the site as an undeveloped plot and did not consider the subject site to have been clearly laid out as communal open space. Given the extent of applicant's ownership, I do not

consider the proposals to have any impacts on third party lands and having regard to the layout and pattern of development proposed I do not regard the development of these lands as unacceptable in principle.

8.3.3. The new dwellings would have a wider footprint than the adjacent dwellings and an increased setback from the Station View Road (3m approx.). 1m high boundary walls are also being proposed to the front of the dwelling along Station View Road. This is not characteristic to the existing dwellings along Station View. The design of proposed dwellings is similar in form to the existing dwellings across the road, along the eastern side of Church Road rather than dwellings within its immediate vicinity. However, as only the side elevation of the dwelling addresses Church Road, the building will appear differently at street level.

8.3.4. Design for corner site developments should ideally respect both streetscapes. The current proposal does not provide a coherent design solution as required by Section 12.16 of the Development Plan, given the building is designed to duplicate dwellings along Church Road while addressing buildings along Station View. The design includes a side access door to the utility and a window to ground floor WC along the eastern elevation addressing Church Road. However, the proposed 1.8m high privacy screen addressing Church Road will block the limited ground level openings proposed at street level creating a hostile street interface here. This can be altered by condition if permission is considered so that the privacy screen is set behind the proposed building line. Even with these amendments I do not consider the building to provide an appropriate design response along Church Road given its extensive depth (11m), which is mostly blank and devoid of any meaningful openings that would provide any street animation or passive surveillance. Although this could also be addressed post consent by condition, this would require significant alterations to the floor plans including relocation of stairwell and mirroring the proposed floor plans to provide additional windows along the eastern elevation. I do not consider this to be appropriate to be dealt by condition. Additionally, I have further concerns regarding the quality of private amenity spaces and space standards achieved in the development. This will be discussed in detail below.

8.3.5. Section 4.4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines under 'Responsive Built Form' requires new developments to respond positively to established pattern and form of development. New buildings should be designed to present well-defined edges to

streets that are well-overlooked with active street frontages. I am not satisfied that the proposed design would provide appropriate animation onto Church Road or enhance the existing built environment. I consider the development in its proposed format to be contrary to the provisions of Section 4.4 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines and if permitted will detrimentally impact the established character of the area.

8.4. Residential Amenity

8.4.1. Section 12.2 and 12.6 of the Development Plan requires new development proposals to have regard to the qualitative and quantitative guidelines provided within the relevant Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines. Although, the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines 2007 sets out the best practice standards for new dwellings, no specific reference has been made in relation to these guidelines in the Development Plan. The proposed 2 no. dwellings would not comply with the recommended minimum residential standards for a 3 bedroom/ 5-person/2 storey dwelling as per the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines 2007, particularly in terms of bedroom sizes and aggregate living areas. The Development Plan under Section 12.6 for Residential Development (Urban) refer to Sustainable Residential Developments in Urban Areas-Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2009 and associated Best Practice Urban Design Manual, 2009 as guidance for urban design principles.

8.4.2. The applicant has stated that the 2 no. dwellings are provided with high quality residential amenity space of 60sqm and 100sqm. Although, the development would quantitatively satisfy the minimum open space requirement for a 3-bedroom dwelling as per SPPR2 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines, I would have significant reservations with regard to the quality of these spaces. The rear gardens directly address the side and front elevation of an existing warehouse building to the rear. There are currently windows along the front / eastern elevation of the warehouse building overlooking the proposed rear garden of the corner dwelling. Any screening along the site boundary would directly block these windows rendering them unusable. I would also have concerns regarding the daylight levels achieved by the

rear garden of the second dwelling given the site orientation, its restricted depth and location adjacent to the warehouse building.

8.4.3. Each dwelling is provided with 1 no. in-curtilage car parking. Table 12.1 of the Development Plan requires a minimum carparking provision of 1.5spaces per dwellings of 1-3 bedrooms. However, reduced parking is encouraged where smarter travel plans can be implemented. SPPR 3 of Compact Settlement Guidelines mandates a maximum parking provision of 2 spaces per dwelling for 'peripheral sites' located in small towns. Applicants have not provided the rationale / justification for the number of car parking spaces proposed. Given the proximity of the site to Castlerea train station, I consider the reduced parking provision acceptable at this location. If permission is considered for the development, the applicant should be requested to agree in writing with the Planning Authority, the details of construction access and location of construction compound, so that the works do not impact existing residential dwellings along Station View Road.

8.5. Overlooking Overshadowing Impacts

8.5.1. The applicant has not provided a contextual elevation of the site to assess the impact of the scale, massing or height of the proposed buildings on neighbouring dwellings. There are no directly opposing windows at first floor level along the rear elevation. The dwelling will have a separation distance of 11m to its front which is considered acceptable and are not governed by the minimum distance specified under SPPR 1 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

8.5.2. The observations made note possible overshadowing impacts onto dwellings across Station View Road. Having regard to the site orientation, I envisage some overshadowing impacts onto dwellings No. 1 -3 Station View (Nos 1 and 2 are under applicant's ownership). However, given the 11m separation with existing dwellings along Station View Road, I do not consider the level of overshadowing impacts to be significant. Any likely overshadowing impacts would be of a scale that is to be expected for a suburban site location such as this.

8.6. Traffic Safety

8.6.1. The previous refusal reason also noted failure to demonstrate adequate sight lines for proposed access from Church Road. This has been mitigated in the current proposal by relocating both vehicular access onto Station View Road. Car Parking

for the corner dwelling is provided at approximately 3m from the road edge. Given the lower traffic volume served by Station View Road, I consider the proposed arrangement to be acceptable.

8.6.2. The proposed development is accessed via a local road with possibly a 50km/hr speed limit. Section 12.24 of the Development Plan states that visibility splays for local roads will be determined on a site-specific basis subject to traffic safety. The proposed corner unit has potential to impact the available sight lines at the entrance to Station View Road. In the current proposal the buildings are provided with an increased set back of more than 5m from the edge of Church Road. The proposed 1.8m high timber fencing for added privacy would reduce this setback. The site layout shows a sight visibility of 45m as being available from the entrance to Station View Road (at 2.4m from road edge). The Planning Authority's Roads Section in their assessment report, considered the proposals to be acceptable. The proposed development would not impact the required minimum sight distances as per the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets at the entrance to Station View Road.

8.7. Conclusion

8.7.1. I acknowledge that the proposed design has significantly improved the layout from what was submitted under previous application Ref. ACP-323423-25. However, given the overall substandard quality of private amenity spaces and poor relationship with surrounding streets, I do not consider the development to provide satisfactory level of residential amenity or urban streetscape. It is recommended that permission be refused.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The site is not located within any designated European sites. Cloonchambers Bog SAC and NHA is located 3.4km east of subject site. Corliskea/Trien/Cloonfelliv Bog SAC and NHA is located 3.9km south of subject site.

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

9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Scale and size of the proposed development within an existing urban setting.
- The lack of connections to the SAC.
- Connection to public water, drain and sewer.

9.5. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

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

10.2. 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.

10.3. 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.

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

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that planning permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the restricted nature of the site and its prominent location along streetscape, the proposed development by reason of the design and layout would fail to achieve satisfactory standard of development, would result in poor relationship along street interfaces and substandard residential amenity for its future occupiers. The development would not accord with Section 4.4 of Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements - Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2024 and provisions set under Section 12.16 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-28. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Sandra Eapen
Planning Inspector

13 July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501115-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing single storey structure and construction of 2 no. infill dwellings
Development Address	Station View, Castlerea, Co. Roscommon
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ 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)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
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?	
☐ 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.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i). Threshold: Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.

Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	
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 ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: Sandra Eapen

Date: 13/07/2026

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP – 501115 - 26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing structure and the construction of 2 no. dwellings
Development Address	Station View, Castlerea, Co. Roscommon.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The construction of 2 no. new dwellings with a total floor area of 218sqm on a site area of 0.636ha. The works would not require substantial natural resources or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance beyond its immediate vicinity. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development)	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed

in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The site is located within the built-up area of the town adjacent to a residential area and businesses. Location is 100m from train station. The development is removed from any sensitive natural habitats, sites of significant architectural or cultural heritage, designated sites and landscapes of significance identified in the Development Plan. While the effects of such work have not been fully assessed, the effects of such are localised are not considered so significant to require EIA.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. 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.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: Sandra Eapen

Date:13/07/2026

