



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501116-RN-26

Development	Retention of alterations, steel storage container and solar panels with all associated site works
Location	Killappoge, Croghan, Boyle, Co. Roscommon
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560504
Applicant(s)	Tony & Rosalie Mc Manus
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Retention
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Tony & Rosalie Mc Manus
Observer(s)	None
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
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History	6
5.0 Policy Context	7
6.0 EIA Screening	8
7.0 The Appeal	8
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
7.2. Planning Authority Response	9
7.3. Observations	10
8.0 Assessment	10
9.0 AA Screening	15
10.0 Water Framework Directive	16
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations	17
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	19
Appendix 2: WFD Impact Assessment Scoping	23

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. Subject appeal is in relation to a former school building (former Croghan National School) in Killappogue, Croghan, Boyle, Co. Roscommon. The site measuring c.0.283ha is located within Croghan Village and accessed off local road L1026.
- 1.2. The existing building on site is a part double storey, part single storey structure with pitched roof along the main building section and flat roof over the single storey side extensions. The site has two vehicular access points off the L1026. The site compound also includes other single storey structures. The site is bound by low brick wall along the road and side boundaries.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is being sought for the following works
 - Elevational changes and internal alterations made to the building. Internal alterations include subdivision of existing classrooms and the creation of a first floor to serve residential purposes. External works include removal of chimney, insertion of new gable windows and replacement of windows/doors.
 - Erection of ancillary steel storage container (c.14.78sqm) and ground mounted solar panels (32sqm) to the rear of the existing building.
 - Modifications made to the existing vehicular entrance at the southwest corner of the site, removing existing stone walls, erecting timber posts and gates, widening of opening to 8m.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. A decision to refuse permission was made by the Planning Authority on 9th March 2026 for the following 1 no. reason:

Reason No. 1

Having regard to the fact that the various elements of development for which retention permission has been sought have been undertaken to give effect to a change of use of the former vacant school premises to residential use, the Planning Authority is not satisfied that the existing onsite wastewater treatment system has sufficient capacity to adequately serve the subject development. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the existing wastewater treatment system upon which the subject development is reliant, will provide adequate treatment for wastewater generated on site, to ensure that it is adequately attenuated and disposed of safely and in accordance with the relevant EPA Code of Practice. The proposed development would accordingly be injurious to public health and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officer's **first report** (dated 16 December 2025) notes the ongoing enforcement case, Reg. Ref. UDR 2984, on subject site regarding the change of use of subject property from school to residential use, for the purpose of accommodating displaced persons. The change of use was declared as not exempt development under Reg. Ref. DED 600. An Enforcement Notice was also issued in relation to the change of use, placement of steel container, amendments to vehicular entrance, and changes to the elevation. The report considers works proposed under this application to be acceptable in principle. Concerns were raised regarding the location of the steel container as it was considered to impact the visual amenities of the area and was recommended to be removed.

The planning report states that the internal and external alterations carried out to the building gives effect to the unauthorised change of use of the building. The planner considered it premature to grant retention permission to the development without determining the serviceability of the site. Applicant was requested to demonstrate the suitability of existing wastewater treatment system to accommodate the proposed changes. The report also notes limited sight distance available at the modified entrance due to the curvature of the road. A revised site layout plan showing

maximum sightlines were requested. The report also considered the solar panels on site to result in potential glint and glare along adjacent local road. A Glint and Glare Assessment was therefore requested. The applicant was asked to address these by Further Information.

A **second report** (dated 6 March 2026) prepared following the receipt of the response to further information is the basis for the refusal. This report took into consideration the recommendations made by the Environmental Departments stating that the existing WWTS would require upgrade/replacement. As the works cannot be accommodated as part of the current application, it was recommended that permission be refused.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- **Environmental Department** (dated 17 February 2026): Report addressing of response to Further Information requested further clarifications.

The report notes that the subject site was previously investigated as part of a pollution complaint, and as per the applicant's response for the same the temporary accommodation use was for a maximum of 15 persons. This would mean that the population equivalent (PE) of the existing domestic wastewater treatment system (WWTS) exceeds the 10PE threshold for a domestic setting and would fall under the regulatory framework of the "EPA Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels, 1999." The applicant's Further Information response however states the occupancy of subject building as 6 no. persons. However, issues were raised regarding the capacity volume of the Septic Tank which was found to be lower than the minimum design capacity of 2600lites (2.6m³) recommended for 4PE or less as per Section 7.1.1 of the EPA code of practice 2021. It was concluded from this that the existing DWWTS has insufficient capacity, and upgrade works are required to accommodate the suggested population equivalent on site. The applicant was requested to submit full site suitability assessment, site layout plan and cross section details of the WWTS. Alternatively, if the applicant is proposing to connect to the public sewer system evidence of the feasibility of the same from Irish Water was requested as clarifications to further information.

- **Roads Department** (dated 6 March 2026): No objection in response to Further Information Response submitted by applicant.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No response received

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

None on file

4.0 **Planning History**

Reg. Ref. DED 600 – Development declared as **not exempt** –The re-purposing of existing building and facilities of the primary school, temporary new build accommodation and structures for the provision of emergency accommodation for ‘displaced persons’ was considered to not constitute exempted development as the declaration query and application documentation was contingent on the construction of permanent extensions to the existing building.

Reg. Ref. UDR 2948 – Enforcement Investigation ongoing on subject site for the material change of use, alterations to external elevations, installation of solar panels, widening of site access, storage of steel container without the benefit of planning permission. An **Enforcement Notice** was issued on 8 September 2025 requiring the following:

- Remove all ground mounted solar panels within the curtilage of site
- Remove the steel container placed within the curtilage of site
- Reinstate existing vehicular entrance located to the south-west of the site back to its original design arrangement
- Refrain from any development activity to the exterior of the former school building on site until proceeding in conformity with a valid planning permission

A **Pollution Complaint Investigation** warning letter was also issued for subject site in November 2025 following a site inspection by the Planning Authority which noted seepage of sewage effluents between the septic tank risers. Applicant was asked to

carry out necessary remedial works to prevent roof water from entering WWTP and for preventing seepage within 40 days. The applicant has stated that sufficient remedial actions have been undertaken on site.

Reg. Ref. PD/13/283 – Permission was sought for the demolition of the existing old school building and associated structure on subject site for the construction of a new single storey dwelling. The application was deemed **withdrawn** following no response being submitted within the statutory time period to the further information request on the suitability of the wastewater treatment system (WWTS), sight lines, recovery/disposal of materials, amendments to the dwelling design, feasibility to connect with public foul sewer.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. The subject appeal site is situated in un-zoned lands governed by **Rural Policy Zone B** as per Section 3.1 of the Development Plan. Croghan Village is denoted as a ‘Serviced Village’ within the Settlement Hierarchy. The following policies and sections are relevant to subject appeal application:

Policy ITC 7.40 – requires new development within proximity to public wastewater infrastructure to connect to that sewer.

Policy ITC 7.46 – requires private wastewater treatment plants to be in compliance with EPA’s Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (PE. ≤10) (2009).

Section 12.12 Wastewater Treatment - requires all developments to connect with the mains foul sewer system where available.

Section 12.24 Roads and Transportation- sets the requirements for safe unobstructed sight distances. Local roads are required to have a visibility splay of 90m.

Table 12.1 Car Parking Standards – residential uses of 4+ bedrooms are required to provide 2 car parking spaces per unit.

Appendix 4 Wastewater Treatment Capacity – Shows additional capacity available - Current population indicated as 203 and design capacity is stated as 400 PE

5.3 Natural Heritage Designations

Subject site is located within c.6.5km of NHA Tullaghan Bog (Site Code 001652) and Proposed NHA Lough Drumharlow (Site Code 001643).

Site is also within c.12.5km of Annaghmore Lough SAC (Site Code 001626) and Lough Gara SPA (Site Code 004048).

6.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination.

Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

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

- The refusal decision extends beyond the scope of the development subject to retention. Planning officer originally recommended permission be granted.
- Further improvements to WWTS can be addressed by condition rather than refusal
- The matters subject to enforcement action did not include the wastewater treatment system.
- The planning authority as part of the enforcement action had previously acknowledged and agreed that the temporary change of use of the building for

accommodating displaced persons is exempt under Class 20F of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 as amended.

- Building has remained vacant from 2009. Refurbishment works were undertaken in 2024 to bring the building back into use, thereby reducing vacancy
- Installation of gable windows and attic conversion, upgrade to building fabric and replacement windows/doors were done as part of fire safety certification.
- No extension to the building footprint. Only existing building is being used for temporary accommodation.
- The applicant claims that subject retention works are confined to the existing building footprint and does not involve an intensification of use.
- The WWTS is long established serving the school since 1955 for 54 years. The current loading (6PE) is substantially less than the historical school use (52 PE).
- The maximum scenario is only 15PE well below the historical use.
- EPA Code of Practice applies primarily to new WWTS and not to legacy systems
- The remedial works requested by Environmental Section under the pollution investigation were completed. They did not require system replacement.
- No evidence of pollution, environmental impact or system failure. Only precautionary and theoretical interpretation of wastewater guidance
- Environmental sections response to the further information is a design-based approach and did not take into account the existing legacy system. A performance-based approach would be more appropriate.
- The refusal relies disproportionately on consideration of a separate and unimplemented proposal under Reg. Ref. DED 600 (Section 5 Declaration) which also included proposals for a permanent extension to existing building.
- The storage container serves ancillary functions – hosting backup generator

7.2. Planning Authority Response

None on file

7.3. Observations

None on file

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1. The subject application seeks retention planning permission for the internal and external alterations carried out to the existing (former) school building, modifications to the vehicular entrance, installation of a metal shed and solar panels at the site. The applicant has carried out significant alterations to the existing school building, to refurbish and reuse the existing built envelope. The former 2no. double storey classrooms have been converted into two separate floors with living room and kitchen provided at ground level and 2 no bedrooms provided within the new upper level. The former cloak rooms, boiler room, and toilet blocks have been modified into 2 no. bedrooms, WC/showers and a communal laundry room. A centrally located chimney breast and splays that served the 2 no. classrooms was also removed to facilitate a new stairway to the upper floor.
- 8.2. Accommodation use: It is clear from the submitted information, that the works proposed for retention (internal and external) are facilitating a change of use of the school building into residential accommodation use. The applicant has stated within the appeal documentation that the Planning Authority acknowledges within their correspondence under Enforcement Case Ref. UDR 2984 (dated 8 Sept 2025) that the subject building is being used as temporary accommodation for displaced persons seeking international protection under Class 20F Part 1 of schedule 2 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 as amended. The applicant had previously applied for a Declaration of Exempt Development certification (Reg. Ref. DED 600) from the County Council with regard to the change of use of the building under Class 20F category and for an extension to the building. The Planning Authority declared the works to be not exempt, stating that the change of use was contingent/ depended on a proposed extension works to the building.
- 8.3. The Class 20F exemption applies to residential accommodation for 'displaced persons' seeking Temporary Protection in Ireland carried out by, or on behalf of, the

Minister of Children, Equality, Disability, Integration and Youth (DCEDIY). Given the changes are substantial in nature, amending the function of the existing building, and impacting the site services available, I agree with the Planning Authority that the works proposed for retention permission cannot be considered in isolation without assessing the use of the modified spaces and the serviceability of the site.

- 8.4. Residential Amenities: The modified building now provides for 4 no. large bedrooms, c.25.2sqm, c.25.1sqm within the upper floor and c.24.6sqm, c.12.7sqm at ground floor level. On site visit I noted a minimum of 3 no single beds in each room and 2 no. double beds in the larger rooms. Although, the occupancy of the building is stated as 6no. by the applicant, the converted building would have the capacity to accommodate 15 no. people in total. The new building would exceed the minimum floor area requirements for a 4 bed, 2 storey houses as set out under the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines, 2007.
- 8.5. The applicant has not provided details of the accommodation arrangement such as the number of persons sharing bedrooms or the number of individual families accommodated. The accommodation standards provided are generally in compliance with the Revised guidelines for Temporary Accommodation in Existing Buildings for those fleeing the war in Ukraine, updated October 2022. 2 no. WC/shower provided at ground floor level are designed to Part M standards allowing for wheelchair movement. Self-service laundry facilities are also provided on site. Although storage is not indicated on the drawings provided, this would not be a concern given the surplus in floor area and the availability of an outbuilding on site. It is noted that some of the double storey windows that previously served the classrooms are being shared between the two floors. This is considered acceptable as the rooms are provided with a new gable end window. In addition to the bedrooms, the ground floor area also provides for a large communal living room and kitchen area.
- 8.6. The external alterations carried out are considered to be minor in scale and only consist of replacement of original windows and doors, insertion of 2 no. new gable end windows at first floor level, and the removal of original chimney. I do not consider the external modifications to negatively impact the character of the building. The site also includes sufficient amenity area to the rear. I do not have any objection with regard to the residential amenity provided within the converted building.

However, the works carried out includes the addition of a first floor (c.62.32sqm), and material change in the nature of the use on subject site, which would have implications for services such as wastewater treatment.

- 8.7. Wastewater Treatment System (WWTS): The amended building now provides for 5 no. WCs. Although the applicant maintains that the building is only being used by 6 no. people, the building currently has accommodation capacity for up to 15 no. people. The existing septic tank is indicated as to have a capacity of 2,142 litres. The applicants suggest that the current residential loading is less than that arising from the original school occupancy of 52 students and teachers' of 2600 l/day. The applicant estimates a current capacity requirement of 900 l/day based on an occupancy of 6 no. persons and 2250 l/day based on an occupancy of 15no. persons. However, based on Section 7.1.1 of the 2021 EPA Code of Practice (for DWWTS of PE<10) a population equivalent of 6 would require a tank capacity of 2,900 litres (150x6 +2000). This would be increased for an occupancy of 15 persons and should be calculated based on the 1999 EPA Wastewater Treatment Manual for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels.
- 8.8. Article 22(2)(c) of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 as amended, requires all planning applications for developments that are not connected to the public sewer to be accompanied by information on the on-site treatment system and evidence of the suitability of the site for the proposed system. The application does not propose or include any works to the existing treatment system, however, there is a change in the nature of the occupancy on the site arising from the works proposed. The Planning Authority's Environmental Divisions report in response to the Further Information notes that the existing WWTS on site has a design capacity less than the minimum capacity stated by EPA Code for 4 persons and thereby was considered to be insufficient to treat the effluent generated on site. The report requested clarification to further information including full site suitability assessment, revised site layout plan showing all features of the treatment system and cross-sectional details of the infiltration area. However, the Planning Authority recommended refusal given the concerns regarding the existing WWTS. The applicant has not submitted any additional new information with the appeal to address the Environmental Divisions report or the refusal by the Planning Authority.

- 8.9. No evidence has been provided to show the suitability of the site for a WWTS as per the EPA Code of Practice, 2021, or under the 1999 EPA Wastewater Treatment Manual for Small Communities. An “Assessment of existing Wastewater Treatment System-Legacy Installation”, a document prepared by the applicant themselves was submitted as Further Information Response to the Planning Authority. This report did not include any site investigation study or details of the receiving environment but relies entirely on a performance-based assessment using an approximate calculation of historical loading on the existing WWTS.
- 8.10. The site location plan provided only show the location of a septic tank and does not include details of any existing percolation area or polishing filters serving the tank. The area of the site and location of the tank appears to be inadequate to provide satisfactory disposal of septic tank effluent by percolation. In the absence of information on the soil type, depth, percolation values, groundwater depth, bedrock depth etc I am unable to conclude that the existing septic tank or the infiltration area (if any) will provide sufficient treatment to the wastewater to prevent contamination of groundwater and eliminate any possible negative impact to human health and environment.
- 8.11. Although the applicant claims that there is no evidence of failure or pollution on site, I note that the Planning Authority had previously issued a wastewater pollution complaint for subject site following a site investigation carried out on the 6th of November 2025. The observations made included misconnections, surface water discharge into WWTS and seepage of effluents on site. Following which the applicant had carried out some remedial works. However; this investigation is yet to be closed by the Planning Authority. Failure of a septic tank could also be due to its operation within unsuitable ground conditions or improperly designed percolation area. The EPA Code of Practice also notes that soakaways, soak holes or soak pits are no longer considered acceptable infiltration/treatment for disposal of domestic wastewater.
- 8.12. I note that the site is located on a Regionally Important Aquifer - Karstified (conduit) where the groundwater vulnerability is noted as extreme as per the Geological Survey Ireland (GSI) mapping. The subsoil type available at the site is also categorised as poorly drained as per the GSI mapping. The applicant has not been able to satisfactorily demonstrate that the current solution ensures the protection of

human health and environment. As this application is only seeking retention permission for amendment works carried out to the building, there is no scope to address a replacement, or upgrade works to existing WWTS by condition under this application.

- 8.13. Croghan is recognised as a 'Serviced Village' and Appendix 4 of the Development Plan on Wastewater Treatment Capacity establishes that Croghan Treatment Plant has capacity to accommodate an additional 197 units. Policy ITC 7.40 requires all new development within proximity of existing Wastewater Treatment Plants and public sewer to connect with that. However, the applicant has not provided any details to demonstrate the feasibility for this connection. This was also part of the clarifications requested by Planning Authority's Environmental Division. Therefore, based on the information provided it is not possible to establish that a connection to public sewer can be provided to service the site. I recommend that permission be refused for the proposed development.
- 8.14. Widening of vehicular entrance: The applicant has modified one of the two vehicular entrances available to the site by widening the opening from c.3.5m to c 8m by removing boundary walls and replacing it with timber fencing and gates. The changes are minor in nature and the modified boundary wall, is not considered to be of any cultural or architectural significance. I do not consider the widening of vehicular entrance to result in any road safety concerns. Adequate sight lines as required by the Development Plan would be available from the widened entrance. However, I do not consider the timber finishes to be an unacceptable replacement to the original low brick wall. If the commission is minded to grant permission for the proposed development, it is recommended that the applicant be requested to make good the remaining boundary wall with matching finishes.
- 8.15. Installation of Metal shed and solar panels: The subject site is visible to the front and rear along public roads. The placement of the metal shed, and solar panels to the rear of the dwelling are visible along the rear elevation of the site due to the higher site topography. The Planning Authority's report recommended the removal of the metal shed to the rear owing to the visual impact to the site. The applicant has stated that the metal shed is being used to house the backup generator for the building in order to support the operation of the building during power outages. There are other outbuildings on site which could be repurposed to house the generator and therefore

do not consider the ancillary metal shed to be necessary to support the operation of the building. I agree with the Planning Authority's assessment and request the omission of the metal shed by a suitably worded condition.

- 8.16. The applicant is also seeking retention permission for the erection of c.32sqm (25sqm is the maximum area for exempt development) free-standing solar panels to the rear of the school building at a maximum height of c.2.6m from ground. A glint and glare study carried out for the development by Arthian Ltd was submitted as part of the Further Information response to the Planning Authority. The report concludes that the solar panels are only visible along a 150m section of the L1403 road to the rear of the site and that the panels have 'no to low impact' on road users. The works are considered to be acceptable. No further amendments are recommended in relation to the erection of solar panels. The installation of solar panels and the metal container is considered to add to the visual clutter along the rear elevation of the building. If the commission is minded to grant permission for the development, this can be mitigated by a suitably worded condition requiring additional screen planting and the omission of the metal shed, post consent.
- 8.17. Conclusion: Having considered the aspects of the proposed retention application, although the modification to the school building meets the adequate accommodation standards, concerns remain regarding the serviceability of the site given the accommodation use which would be facilitated by the proposed development. The application did not provide sufficient evidence to establish the suitability of the site to consider retention permission for the works that enable the accommodation use on site. Although some isolated elements of the development can be allowed, as these works were also carried out to support the accommodation use on site, I do not see the merit in considering them individually. I recommend that permission be refused for the proposed development.

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 subject site is not located within a designated site, with the nearest site being NHA Tullaghan Bog (Site Code 001652) and Proposed NHA Lough Drumharlow

(Site Code 001643) located within c.6.5km of the site. Subject site is also within c.12.5km of Annaghmore Lough SAC (Site Code 001626) and Lough Gara SPA (Site Code 004048).

- 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
 - Location within a serviced village.
 - The lack of connections to the SAC.
- 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 in accordance with Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), as transposed by the European Communities (Water Policy) Regulations 2003, as amended, and with regard to the Eastern/South Eastern River Basin Management Plan 2022–2027.
- 10.2. The receiving water environment has been identified and assessed, see Appendix 2 Table 2 attached. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and in the absence of adequate mitigation measures, the applicant has not demonstrated satisfactorily that the proposed development will not:
- Result in deterioration of the ecological, chemical, or quantitative status of any relevant surface water or groundwater body;
 - Increase pollutant loading or alter the hydrological regime of any receiving watercourse;

- Impede achievement of environmental objectives under the applicable River Basin Management Plan.

10.3. Accordingly, it remains uncertain as to whether the proposed development is compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the development for which retention permission is being sought and the nature of the occupancy which would be facilitated thereby, the Commission is not satisfied that the existing wastewater treatment system is sufficient to satisfactorily treat and dispose of the effluent likely to be generated on site. Permitting the proposed retention works would be premature pending the confirmation of feasibility to connect to the public sewer or the satisfactory demonstration of safe disposal of septic tank effluent in accordance with the relevant EPA Code of Practice. 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

09 July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501116-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Retention permission is being sought for internal and external alterations, modifications to 1no. vehicular entrance, installation of free-standing solar panels and erection of metal container on site.
Development Address	Killappoge, Croghan, Boyle, 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.	

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: 09 July 2026

Appendix 2: WFD Impact Assessment Scoping

Table 1

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-501116-RN-26	Townland, address	Killappoge, Croghan, Boyle, Co. Roscommon
Description of project		Retention permission is being sought for internal and external alterations, modifications to 1no. vehicular entrance, installation of free-standing solar panels and erection of metal container on site. The works give effect to a change of use from school to residential accommodation use.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		Site is located within an existing rural village settlement. The existing treatment plant is not fit for the scale of development and therefore has potential to result in groundwater pollution.	
Proposed surface water details		Surface water is proposed to discharge to soakpits.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Public mains	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	The applicant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the existing onsite wastewater treatment system has sufficient capacity to adequately serve the subject development or provide for safe disposal of treated wastewater. The existing treatment system is indicated as to have a capacity of only 2,142 litres. The current loading based on an occupancy of between 6 (@ 900 l/day) to 15no. persons (@ 2250 l/day) is likely to require upgrades the system. Any works to the treatment system is out of scope of this application
Others?	

Table 2

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)	Mitigation Measures proposed	Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?
Carrick on Shannon (Groundwater body)	IE_SH_G_048	Good (2019-2024)	Not at risk	N/A	Chemical and physico-chemical loading from Wastewater treatment plant	Not clear	Uncertain
KILLUKIN_010 (River)	IE_SH_26K020100	Moderate (2019-2024)	At risk	Nutrients, DWTS, Ag	Chemical and physico-chemical loading from Wastewater treatment plant	Not clear	Likely impacts cannot be eliminated. Applicant has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that the site is suitable for the on-site treatment and disposal of wastewater.