



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501186-SO-26

Development	Retention and completion of existing cottage, retention and completion of extension. Upgrade septic tank and associated site works.
Location	Ballyconnell Td., Ballinfull, Co. Sligo
Planning Authority	Sligo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/60383
Applicant(s)	Barbara McInerney
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission with Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Sheila McSweeney
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	31 st July 2026
Inspector	Philip Maguire

Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Site Location and Description	3
3.0 Proposed Development	4
4.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
4.1. Decision	4
4.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
4.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
4.4. Third Party Observations	7
5.0 Planning History.....	8
6.0 Policy Context.....	9
7.0 EIA Screening.....	11
8.0 The Appeal	11
8.1. Grounds of Appeal	11
8.2. Applicant Response	12
8.3. Planning Authority Response	13
9.0 Assessment	14
10.0 AA Screening.....	19
11.0 Water Framework Directive	19
12.0 Recommendation	19
13.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	20
14.0 Conditions	20
Appendix 1 (EIA Screening)	23
Appendix 2 (AA Screening)	27
Appendix 3 (WFD Screening)	32

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This case relates to an appeal by Sheila McSweeney under the provisions of Section 37 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended ('the Act'), following a grant of permission by Sligo County Council in accordance with Section 34 of the Act.
- 1.2. This Inspector's Report (IR) and recommendation is made pursuant to Section 376(3) of the Planning and Development Act 2024, as amended (the 2024 Act). An Coimisiún Pleanála ('the Commission') is required to consider both before determining the case.

2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. Situated in the rural townland of Ballyconnell on the northern peninsula of Sligo Bay, north of Raghly Point / Brown's Bay, the appeal site is located c. 10km west of Carney village in north Sligo. The site lies at the end of a narrow single-track road (L3207) albeit subject to a 60kph speed limit. The L3207 also provides access to the sand and shingle beach / cove to the south. The surrounding area is generally characterised by coastal farmland interspersed with rural housing. The pattern of development is more pronounced to the east with four dwellings and a number of cabin-type structures.
- 2.2. The appeal site is irregular shaped and forms part of a larger landholding that extends in a westerly direction and includes a peninsula of land bounded by the sea. Site boundaries are mainly undefined. A notice at the site entrance refers to the holding as Heron's Cove and indicates that it is a wildlife sanctuary, farm and residence. The appeal site has a stated area of 0.161 hectares and consists of a single-storey building, access track and part of a field to the west. The building is an unclad, timber frame structure with a slate pitched roof and flat roof projection to the southern gable. It is under construction, albeit works appear to be dormant. In this regard, I note the foundations of a rear projection have begun to re-colonise with vegetation. Internally the building is shell-like with some timber stud partitions evident inside the front porch.
- 2.3. There is a small cottage immediately adjacent, albeit outside the appeal site boundary. It too is undergoing significant works with evidence of some old walls remaining. To the rear of that there is a timber and stone outbuilding with sedum roof finish and west-facing veranda. It too is outside the site boundary and barn-like in appearance, although it would seem to be currently in use for the storage of domestic-related items.

3.0 Proposed Development

3.1. Planning permission is sought to retain and complete a replacement dwelling etc.

3.2. The proposed development is described in the statutory notices as:

- “1. Retention and completion of re-construction of existing cottage,*
- 2. Retention and completion of new extensions to east and west elevations,*
- 3. Planning permission for upgrade of existing septic tank to new proprietary effluent treatment system and percolation area to existing cottage.”*

3.3. In addition to the applicant’s cover letter (June 2025), application documents include:

- Appropriate Assessment Screening (ESC Environmental, May 2025)
- Site Characterisation Report (ESC Environmental, July 2025)

3.4. The following was also submitted in response to a Further Information (FI) request:

- FI response letter (Castlegal Architectural Services, February 2026)
- FI response letter (ESC Environmental, February 2026)

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

4.1.1. Permission was granted on 24th February 2026 subject to 3 no. conditions, including:
Condition 3 – payment of a development contribution within 3 months of final grant.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. The Planner’s Report (03/11/25) can be summarised as follows:

Principle of Development

- Notes Plan policy to retain and sensitively restore vernacular dwellings and refers to the circumstances that led to the demolition and rebuild of the dwelling.
- States that the proposal is presented as being an exact replacement of the previous dwelling except for the addition of a rear extension and a front porch.

- Notes the issues raised within 3rd party submissions and states that further information, in the form of a detailed report and further drawings outlining the extent of all changes to the existing dwelling, as part of its reconstruction is required.

Visual Impact / Siting / Design

- States that the proposal is presented as a dwelling with vernacular proportions and finishes and suggests that the rear addition is of an appropriate scale and is of a form and finish which replicates traditional rural and agricultural buildings.
- Notes that while it would be visible from some public areas including nearby beaches and coastline it would be seen within the context of the existing built development and therefore would not have a significant detrimental visual impact.

Residential Amenity

- Notes the proximity of the adjacent cottage with shared spaces and driveway; states that there would be lower expectations in terms of privacy as a result.
- States the proposal would not significantly change this relationship and otherwise is well set-in from shared boundaries with no overshadowing or loss of light.

Highway Safety / Traffic / Car Parking

- Notes that the proposal does not include any alterations to the existing access and states that there is sufficient space to park and turn on the site.

Services

- Notes that the proposal includes the decommissioning / replacement of the existing septic tank with a new system with potential improvements in water quality.
- Notes the environment section have no objection in principle but required further information to ensure that the proposal complies with the EPA CoP.
- States that further information on surface water disposal is also required.

Appropriate Assessment (AA) / Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- AA is not required; excludes the need for EIA at preliminary examination stage.

Recommendation

- Recommends FI in respect of the previous dwelling and site drainage proposals.

4.2.2. The Planner's Report (23/03/26) can be summarised as follows:

Assessment of Further Information

Item 1 – Extent of Changes

- States that the details indicate the extent of changes of the replacement dwelling compared to the former cottage, noting that this includes development of habitable rooms / space to the area that was previously occupied by outbuildings.
- Notes that the built footprint has increased as have the height / levels and scale of the building, and notably the hay-barn-like addition to the west.
- States that the form is also changed to the core building and it now has a longer unbroken ridgeline along the building length with less articulation.
- Refers to policy P-DHOU-1 regarding replacement dwellings and considers that the development is of an acceptable scale for the context, noting that it occupies a similar footprint and built volume of previous development to the site.
- Considers that the design of the dwelling is reflective of the rural vernacular in terms of form, scale, design and materiality

Items 2 to 4 – Wastewater Treatment

- States that the design of the proposed DWWTS is in line with the EPA CoP subject to conditions relating to its proper installation and on-going maintenance.

Item 5 – Surface Water

- Notes that rainwater will drain to a soakaway and raises no further concerns.

Other

- Notes the withdrawn application relating to the adjacent cottage but states that this is outside of the site boundary and thus not for consideration under this application.

Recommendation

- Considers that the proposal would not be injurious to the amenities of property in the vicinity, would not be prejudicial to public health, is acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience, does not have an adverse impact on the Natura sites etc.
- Recommends a grant of permission on this basis.

4.2.3. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer (10/10/25) No objection subject to condition(s).
- Environment (04/03/26) No objection subject to condition(s).

4.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

4.4. Third Party Observations

4.4.1. The planning authority received 2 no. third party observations. Issues raised reflect the appeal grounds. Concerns, as summarised from the Planner's Report, relate to:

- Overdevelopment, excessive floor area compared to existing and nearby development.
- Design not in-keeping with the vernacular style of dwellings in North Sligo.
- Development will be visually intrusive, including the 'barn like' structure to the rear.
- Queries the status of other development on landholding including the other cottage and stables as well as the removal of the ditch to part of the site.

4.4.2. Notes that one of the submissions includes a copy of sales particulars of the property (stated as being from 2021); considers, on review of said particulars, that the proposed replacement is of significant increase in scale compared to the previous cottage.

4.4.3. Additional observations received by the planning authority at FI stage generally reflect initial concerns. New issues, as summarised from the Planner's Report, relate to:

- Considers the submission misleading i.e., the previous cottage was less than half the size / less than one quarter the area of that proposed.
- States that the proposal should be treated as a new build and not 'reconstruction'.
- Scale of development is excessive compared to other development within the area.
- Notes two existing buildings developed very close to the house and the cumulative impact of these would represent overdevelopment of the area.

5.0 Planning History

5.1. Appeal Site / Landholding

- 5.1.1. PA ref. 25/60382 – in October 2025, an application to upgrade an existing septic tank serving the adjacent cottage to new DWWTS to was withdrawn prior to decision.

5.2. Adjacent Sites

- 5.2.1. PA ref. 00/686 – in October 2000, planning permission was refused for a house and DWWTS. It was considered that the proposal would detract to an undue degree from the rural character and scenic amenities of the area having regard to the open coastal location and visually vulnerable designation; and thus, seriously injure the amenities of the area. It was also considered that the proposal would seriously injure the amenities of existing and proposed houses by reason of overlooking and visual intrusion; and in conjunction with existing and permitted housing in an unserviced rural area would give rise to an excessive density and haphazard settlement pattern etc.
- 5.2.2. PA ref. 00/1122 – in April 2001, planning permission was refused to replace an existing holiday home with a house and DWWTS. It was considered that the proposal would detract to an undue degree from the rural character and scenic amenities of the area having regard to the open coastal location and visually vulnerable designation; and thus, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. It was also considered that the proposal, taken in conjunction with existing and permitted housing in an unserviced rural area would give rise to an excessive density and haphazard settlement pattern.
- 5.2.3. PA ref. 02/939 – in April 2003, planning permission was refused for a house and DWWTS. It was considered that the proposal would constitute undesirable haphazard backland development in an unserviced rural area, which by reason of overlooking would detract from the residential amenities of adjoining properties. It was also considered that the proposal would constitute an excessive density at this location and detract from the rural character and scenic amenities of this coastal location and thus, seriously injure the visual amenities of the area; and be prejudicial to public health.
- 200m Northeast*
- 5.2.4. PA ref. 17/356 – in July 2018, planning permission was granted for the retention and completion of a replacement dwellinghouse with installation of new DWWTS etc.

6.0 Policy Context

6.1. Local Planning Policy

- 6.1.1. The Sligo Development Plan 2024-2030 came into effect on 11th November 2024. It was subject to a draft Ministerial Direction in July 2024 and is pending a final decision by the Minister following public consultation and OPR recommendations (Oct. 2024). The planning authority decision was made under the provisions of this current Plan.
- 6.1.2. The appeal site is within a rural area north of Raghly Point on the Sligo coastline. The entire coastline is designated as a Visually Vulnerable Area in the Plan and the adjoining road is a Scenic Route (Chapter 23 / Landscape Characterisation Map).
- 6.1.3. Other guidance is set out in Chapter 24 (Natural heritage), Chapter 25 (Built heritage), Chapter 26 (Residential development) and Chapter 30 (Water infrastructure) etc.
- 6.1.4. The following sections are relevant to the proposed development:
- 23.2 – Landscape Character Assessment
 - 24.1 – Biodiversity
 - 25.1 – Archaeological heritage
 - 25.3 – Architectural heritage
 - 26.5 – Miscellaneous housing provisions
 - 30.2 – Wastewater Treatment
- 6.1.5. Summary of policies relevant to the proposed development:
- | | |
|---------|--|
| P-LCP-2 | Seeks to discourage any developments that would be detrimental to the unique visual character of designated Visually Vulnerable Areas. |
| P-LCP-3 | Seeks to preserve the scenic views and the distinctive visual character of designated Scenic Routes by controlling development along such routes while facilitating development tied to a specific location etc.

In all cases, strict location, siting and design criteria shall apply, as set out in Section 33.4 of the development management standards. |
| P-BD-8 | Where buildings are proposed to be restored or demolished/replaced, the applicants/developers shall check for the presence of protected |

wildlife species and follow the protocols set out in the Heritage Council's guidelines *Wildlife in Buildings – Linking Our Built and Natural Heritage*.

- P-AH-1 Seeks to protect, manage, and enhance archaeological sites, monuments and landscapes etc.
- P-VH-1 Generally requires the retention, sensitive restoration and sustainable re-use of historic buildings, structures and features in the County, including vernacular dwellings, farm buildings, paving, historic boundary treatments or layouts. There will be a presumption against the demolition of older buildings where restoration and adaptation are feasible.
- P-VH-2 Ensure that conversions or extensions to vernacular buildings or the provision of new adjoining buildings, are sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic buildings. Demolition or removal will be considered only in exceptional circumstances.
- P-DHOU-1 Seeks to encourage the renovation and reuse of derelict houses and consider replacement houses on their merits. Such structures should be generally intact and exhibit the main characteristics of a dwelling.
- P-DHOU-2 Generally require the retention and restoration of vernacular dwellings of local architectural, cultural or social significance. Replacement only considered where the building cannot be made structurally sound etc.
- P-WWT-5 All proposals for on-site treatment systems shall be designed, constructed and maintained in accordance with the EPA CoP 2021.

6.1.6. Other relevant guidance is set out in Chapter 33 (Development Management Standards), i.e., Section 33.2 (General standards) and 33.4 (Housing in rural areas).

6.2. National Planning Policy and Guidelines

Sustainable Rural and Gaeltacht Housing

6.2.1. The draft National Planning Statement (NPS) on Sustainable Rural and Gaeltacht Housing (DHLGH, 2026) will eventually replace the 2005 Rural Housing Guidelines when approved. Section 4.5 of the draft states that where permission is granted for the replacement of a habitable dwelling, it should be the intention of the applicant to occupy the proposed rural house as a permanent and primary residence and the 10-year occupancy clause requirement should be applied as part of the eligibility criteria.

6.3. Natural Heritage Designations

6.3.1. Nearest proposed Natural Heritage Areas (pNHAs):

- Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) pNHA (000627) – 0km (overlaps site)

6.3.2. Nearest Special Areas of Conservation (SACs):

- Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC (000627) – 0km (overlaps site)

6.3.3. Nearest Special Protection Areas (SPAs):

- Ballintemple and Ballygilgan SPA (004234) – c. 0.8km southeast
- Ardboline Island and Horse Island SPA (004135) – 1.1km south
- Drumcliff Bay SPA (004013) – c. 3km southeast

6.3.4. Nearest Ramsar site:

- Cummeen Strand (842) – c. 11km southeast

7.0 EIA Screening

7.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (Appendix 1). 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 proposal, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not therefore required.

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

8.1.1. A third-party appeal has been lodged by Sheila McSweeney, summarised as follows:

Vernacular and Heritage

- Site is an integral part of the heritage of the area and has changed very little since the 1960's, referring to a reproduced photo enclosed with the appeal from that time.

- Site was one of a number of key settlements at the edge of the peninsula and the last standing at Roskeeragh Point as the sea forced other inhabitants inland.
- Proposal contravenes Section 25.3.3 of the Development Plan and the Council's commitment to vernacular heritage.
- Area is a natural habitat for birds and wildlife.

Landscape

- Proposal so close to the shoreline and visible from the promontory fort at Knocklane goes against the Council's commitment to the rich heritage of Sligo.
- No reference is made to the unique fossil shoreline to the north of the site.
- This is a landscape that needs to be protected; it has remained unspoilt for generations and no regard has been given to the sensitivity from the shore.

Other Matters

- Refers to sale listing information enclosed in the submission to the planning authority as evidence of the extent to which the site has been developed.
- Raises concerns regarding the "existing stables" and the applicant's attitude towards the development of the site given the Council's response to same.
- Raises concerns regarding the circumstances in which planning applications for both dwellings on the landholding were submitted.
- Raises concerns regarding access to the cart track at the back of the settlement which was an important link along the shore and used for generations.

8.2. Applicant Response

8.2.1. A response from the applicant, Barbara McInerney, is summarised as follows:

- Reconstruction undertaken with the intention to conserve and retain from a heritage and ecological perspective but structural condition prevented retention.
- Cottage not lived in for over a decade and suffered from damp; attempts to restore the breathability through plaster and block removal revealed that they were holding up the structure and restoration was deemed unsafe from that point onwards.

- Rebuild and extension is intended to be in keeping with the vernacular cluster of farm buildings and within the confines of the original settlement with stone wall and native elder hedge to the west carefully retained.
- Rear projection designed to reflect old hay barns and will be in keeping with similar buildings in the area; buildings discreet and in keeping with coastal landscape.
- No legally registered right of way across the land; shore access remains available.
- Materials include timber frame, hemp-lime infill, recycled brown glass floor insulation so as to keep the structure low-carbon, breathable and climate resilient.
- External finishes will be natural and in the vernacular style including lime render, locally made timber sash windows to the front and recycle Bangor blue slates.
- Intention has also been for this property to be applicant's permanent residence, adding that they have been managing the land to improve habitat quality with red listed ground-nesting birds in the summer and grazing barnacle geese in the winter.
- Delays to occupation of the dwelling interferes with daily habitat management.
- Low, unobtrusive, timber agricultural building was constructed to fit carefully in the landscape with a soil and grass roof, clad with stone and Irish slate and designed to be sustainable and in harmony with its surroundings.
- Intention has always been to maintain, restore and enhance the ecological habitats and species that are special to the coastal machair grassland.

8.3. Planning Authority Response

8.3.1. The planning authority's response can be summarised as follows:

- Refers to the Planner's Report and other reports prepared in connection with the assessment of the application as well as the decision to grant permission.
- No additional information that would alter the decision; considers that the applicant has complied with relevant legislation and other matters are of a civil nature.
- Proposal would be suitable at this location; consistent with the Development Plan.
- Requests the decision of the planning authority to grant permission be upheld.

9.0 Assessment

9.1. Preliminary Points

9.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on the appeal file, including the appeal submissions and observations, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are those raised in the grounds of appeal.

9.1.2. The issues can be addressed under the following headings:

- Visual Amenities
- Heritage Issues
- Other Issues

9.2. Visual Amenities

9.2.1. Planning permission is sought to retain and complete the construction of a single-storey, two-bed dwellinghouse served by new DWWTS and accessed via existing laneway directly off the L3207 where it forms a cul-de-sac at the gated site entrance.

9.2.2. Chief amongst the appellant's concerns is the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area which they state has remained unspoilt for generations. In this regard, they note the visual sensitivities of the shoreline and the proximity of the promontory fort at Knocklane where they suggest that the proposal will be visible from.

9.2.3. The applicant, on the other hand, submits that the proposal is intended to be in keeping with the vernacular cluster of farm buildings with the rear projection designed to reflect old hay barns in keeping with similar buildings in the area and with the coastal landscape. They also note that the external finishes will be natural and in the vernacular style including lime render, timber sash windows and Bangor blue slates.

9.2.4. As noted, the planning authority have referred to the Planner's Reports, stating that the proposal will be suitable at this location and consistent with the Development Plan.

9.2.5. In relation to the Planner's Reports, they note that whilst the dwelling would be visible from some public areas, including nearby coastline, it would be seen within the context of the existing built envelope and would not have a significant harmful visual impact.

General Arrangements

- 9.2.6. As noted, the replacement dwelling has been partially constructed and is a timber frame structure on concrete block foundation walls. The FFL is given as 6mAOD and involved some under-build at the lower end given the marginal slope. In this regard, I note that the previous cottage had a living room at 5.08mAOD and bedroom at 5.3mAOD. The previous sheds to the northern end are shown as 6.30mAOD and this is adequately illustrated on the drawings and images submitted as further information.
- 9.2.7. A note on the drawings indicates that whilst the ridge level has been increased to comply with minimum floor-to-ceiling heights, the roof pitch has been maintained at 39 degrees to reflect the original cottage. The overall footprint of the original cottage, inclusive of sheds to the northern end, is stated as 114.46sq.m whereas the replacement footprint, exclusive of the rear extension, has a stated overall footprint of 118.53sq.m. The gross floor space in the application form is stated as 154.55sq.m.
- 9.2.8. The gable ends range from 4.250m to 5.555m and reflect the vernacular single-room depths. The ridgeline, at some 21 metres long is excessive, but marginally broken towards the northern end. The rear extension, which was only at foundation wall level during my site inspection, adopts a contemporary vernacular form with barrelled roof. The extension, which has a footprint of 5.050m by 9.690m, is offset from the main footprint and linked by a short section of corridor. The maximum height is 4.695m.

Consideration of the Issues

- 9.2.9. As noted, the appeal site is within a rural area north of Raghly Point and Brown's Bay on the Sligo coastline. The entire coastline is designated as a Visually Vulnerable Area in the Development Plan and the adjoining road, the L3207, is a Scenic Route.
- 9.2.10. Whilst I am entirely sympathetic to the concerns of the appellant and I agree that this area of the Sligo coastline has its own unique visual characteristics, I am not convinced that the marginal increase in height and additional built form to the rear would be detrimental to same or to the scenic views from the adjacent public road. These views are generally in a southerly direction towards the beach / cove, as opposed to the west across the site. I therefore agree with the planning authority that the proposal would be seen within the context of the existing built environment from the coastline and I consider it to be sufficiently integrated from the public road. In such circumstances, I do not consider the proposal to contravene policies P-LCP-2 or P-LCP-3 of the Plan.

- 9.2.11. Whilst the appeal site is visible from an informal parking area associated with public access to the promontory fort at Knocklane, this is over a distance of c. 650 metres with the headland itself some 950 metres from the site and across the intervening waterbody. Subject to suitable external finishes, the house will be imperceptible over this distance and therefore I do not consider the proposal contrary to policy P-AH-1.
- 9.2.12. Finally, I note concerns raised at application stage regarding the size of the previous cottage and whilst the drawings suggest that there is only a marginal increase in overall footprint, exclusive of the rear extension, I accept that the habitable floor space was significantly less than that now proposed. There is, however, no restriction in the Development Plan as to the size of replacement dwellings so long as they comply with the guidance contained in Section 26.5.3 in terms of design. In any event the rear extension is generally consistent with Section 33.2.16 i.e., in the case of a vernacular dwelling, extensions should be sympathetic to the scale of the existing building and should enhance its character. I am also fully satisfied that the residential amenity of the future occupant will be adequately served by this modest and well considered replacement and an occupancy condition may be appropriate subject to the government approval of the draft NPS on Sustainable Rural and Gaeltacht Housing.

Conclusion on Visual Amenities

- 9.2.13. On balance, I do not consider that the development proposed to be retained and completed does or will adversely impact on the visual amenities of the area. It is a low-rise, low impact development that nestles into a mature setting and largely replicates the previously demolished cottage as evidenced in the submitted reports.
- 9.2.14. If the Commission are minded to grant permission, I recommend that the external finishes of the dwelling and extension be carefully controlled by planning condition. It is also recommended that existing trees and hedgerows be retained for screening in addition to a condition to ensure the extension is jointly occupied with the dwelling.

9.3. Heritage Issues

- 9.3.1. The appellant has also raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the built and natural heritage of the area. In this regard, it is submitted that the site is an integral part of the heritage of the area with very little change since the 1960's and therefore the proposal contravenes Section 25.3.3 of the Development Plan. The appellant also notes that the surrounding area is a natural habitat for birds and wildlife.

- 9.3.2. The applicant, on the other hand, submits that reconstruction was undertaken with the intention to conserve and retain from a heritage and ecological perspective but the structural condition did not allow for retention of the cottage and buildings. As noted, the proposal is intended to be in keeping with the vernacular cluster of buildings.
- 9.3.3. The applicant also highlights their intention to maintain, restore and enhance the ecological habitats and species that are special to these coastal machair grasslands.
- 9.3.4. As noted, the planning authority have referred to the Planner's Reports, the second of which considers the design reflective of the rural vernacular in terms of form, scale, design and materiality and acceptable in the context of policy P-DHOU-1 of the Plan.

Built Heritage

- 9.3.5. Policy P-VH-1 of the Development Plan outlines a presumption against the demolition of older buildings where restoration and adaptation are feasible and thus generally requires the retention, sensitive restoration and sustainable re-use of historic buildings in the county, including vernacular dwellings and farm buildings. Likewise, policy P-VH-2 states that demolition will be considered only in exceptional circumstances. It also seeks to ensure that extensions to vernacular buildings or new adjoining buildings, are sensitively designed and do not detract from the character of the historic buildings. Similar policies are outlined under P-DHOU-1 and P-DHOU-2 of the Plan in respect of derelict houses, with the latter providing for the replacement of vernacular houses where they cannot be made structurally sound through reasonable measures.
- 9.3.6. It is regrettable that the applicant did not provide a structural report with the application. This would have fully addressed the policy bite point under P-DHOU-2 but on balance, I accept the comments regarding the condition of the cottage and adjoining sheds. Indeed, the restoration and extension work to the adjoining cottage, albeit without the benefit of planning permission, suggest that restoration and conservation is at the heart of the overall project on this landholding. I do not, therefore, consider that restoration and adaptation of the previous cottage were feasible in this particular case, and this only transpired when works began, and thus demolition was fully justified.
- 9.3.7. As noted, the proposal is sensitively designed to generally replicate the cottage and sheds it is replacing. In such circumstances I am fully satisfied that it does not detract from the character of this group of buildings and meets the exceptional circumstances test under policy P-VH-2 and thus there is no contravention of Section 25.3 of the Plan.

Natural Heritage

- 9.3.8. The appeal site, as noted, is previously developed brownfield land save for the section of improved grassland to the rear where the proposed percolation area will be situated.
- 9.3.9. The applicant has stated that they have been managing the wider landholding to improve the quality of habitat, including that of birds, and in this regard, I note the reference to a wildlife sanctuary contained within a notice posted at the entrance. It is thus highly unlikely that the proposal will adversely impact on the natural environment.

Conclusion on Heritage Issues

- 9.3.10. On balance, I do not consider that the development proposed to be retained and completed does or will adversely impact on the built or natural heritage of this area. A screening for Appropriate Assessment (AA) has also been carried out (Section 10).

9.4. Other Issues

- 9.4.1. Amongst the other issues raised by the appellant are concerns regarding the scale at which the appeal site and wider landholding have been developed, including the 'stables' building to the rear of the holding. The suggestion here is that the planning authority failed to take appropriate enforcement action and this encouraged the applicant to redevelop the buildings in the absence of a grant of permission. The appellant also raises concerns regarding access to a cart track used for generations.

Unauthorised Development

- 9.4.2. Regarding the failure of the applicant to seek prior approval to carry out the development to be retained and completed, it is their stated case that the condition of the structural condition of the cottage only became apparent when works commenced.
- 9.4.3. Whilst it is suboptimal that a structural condition survey and report was not conducted prior to demolition, it does not preclude the applicant from proceeding in this manner.

Rights of Way

- 9.4.4. Claims to rights of way are a civil matter to be resolved between the parties having regard to the provisions of Section 34(13) of the 2000 Planning Act, as amended.

Conclusion on Other Issues

- 9.4.5. The above assessment represents my *de novo* consideration of all planning issues material to the proposal to retain and complete the replacement dwelling on site.

10.0 AA Screening

10.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the development proposed to be retained and completed individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC, or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

10.2. This determination is based on:

- Information provided in the submitted AA Screening report,
- The relatively modest scale of the development within an existing brownfield site and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European site,
- Low potential for source impacts of any magnitude,
- Consideration of the conservation objectives of:
 - Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC.

10.3. No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European sites were required to be considered in reaching this conclusion.

11.0 Water Framework Directive

11.1. A screening for the purposes of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) has also been carried out. On the basis of objective information, I conclude that the proposal did / will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives. Thus, it can be excluded from any further assessment (Appendix 3).

12.0 Recommendation

12.1. I recommend that permission be **granted** for the reasons and considerations below.

13.0 Reasons and Considerations

13.1. Having regard to the provisions of Sligo County Development Plan 2024-2030, the location, nature and scale of the proposal in the context of the appeal site and surrounding area, and the prevailing pattern and character of development in this area, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development proposed to be retained and completed would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would provide an acceptable standard of amenity for future occupants, and would not adversely impact on natural or built heritage or give rise to significant effects on any European site, and would otherwise constitute an appropriate form of rural development. The development proposed would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

14.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received on the 20th day of February 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 and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.
2. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the replacement dwelling and proposed extension shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority within three months of the date of this order.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

3. All existing trees and hedgerows shall be retained. Any trees or hedging which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased 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 visual amenity and biodiversity.

4. The replacement dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.

5. (a) The treatment plant and percolation area shall be located, constructed and maintained in accordance with the details submitted to the planning authority on the 16th day of September 2025, as amended by the further plans and particulars received on the 20th day of February 2026, and in accordance with the requirements of the document entitled "Code of Practice - Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (p.e. ≤ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021. No system other than the type proposed in the submissions shall be installed unless agreed in writing with the planning authority.

(b) Certification by the system manufacturer that the system has been properly installed shall be submitted to the planning authority within four weeks of the installation of the system.

(c) A maintenance contract for the treatment system shall be entered into and paid in advance for a minimum period of five years from the first occupancy of the dwellinghouse and thereafter shall be kept in place at all times. Signed and dated copies of the contract shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority within four weeks of the installation.

(d) Surface water soakways shall be located such that the drainage from the dwelling and paved areas of the site shall be diverted away from the location of the percolation area.

(e) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report from a suitably qualified person with professional indemnity insurance certifying that the proprietary effluent treatment system has been installed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details and is working in a satisfactory manner and that the polishing filter is constructed in accordance with the standards set out in the EPA document.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. Water supply and 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.

7. 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 within three months of the date of this order or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

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

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

Philip Maguire

Inspectorate

19th August 2026

Appendix 1 (EIA Screening)

Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501186-SO-26
Proposed Development Summary	Replacement dwelling, including DWWTS etc.
Development Address	Ballyconnell Td., Ballinfull, Co. Sligo
	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? (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)	☒ Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
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)	Class 10(b)(i) 'more than 500 dwellings units' 1 no. dwelling unit proposed.

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: _____

Form 2 – EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501186-SO-26
Proposed Development Summary	Replacement dwelling, including DWWTS etc.
Development Address	Ballyconnell Td., Ballinfull, Co. Sligo
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).	Planning permission is sought to retain and complete the construction of a single-storey, 2-bed dwelling served by a new DWWTS and accessed off local road L3207. The cover letter submitted with the application indicates that the stone walls of the replaced cottage started to fall apart in places when stripped back during renovation works. It states that the original mortar was no more than soil in places with some areas held together by rotten timber or plaster with previous cement and concrete block repairs evident in parts. As noted, the replacement dwelling has been partially constructed and is a timber frame structure on concrete block foundation walls. Construction activities would have required/will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels, concrete and other such substances and give rise to waste for disposal. The demolition of the cottage and sheds would also have given rise to wastes including stone, soil, timbers and metals, in addition to internal fixtures and furnishings. Such wastes were/will be typical of construction sites and significant wastes; emission or pollutants are not anticipated or evident given the size of the cottage. Noise and dust emissions during construction were / are likely but such construction impacts would be / have been localised and temporary in nature. Connection to the proposed DWWTS is dependent on ground conditions and separation distances so as to ensure the protection of receiving ground and surface waters, including nearby drains. Connection to public water infrastructure is proposed. Application referred to Uisce Éireann but no response nor confirmation of feasibility (CoF) with application.

Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development 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 nearest European site, Cummeen Strand/Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC (site code 000627), bounds the appeal site to the west, partly overlapping some of the development proposed to be retained and completed. It is also a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) whilst Cummeen Strand is a Ramsar site and Drumcliff Bay and Sligo Bay are designated shellfish areas. The nearest SPA, Ballintemple and Ballygilgan (site code 004234), is located c. 800 metres to the southeast. Ballygilgan (Lissadell) is also a designated Nature Reserve. There are four NIAH records within 5km of the site. They are to the west of Lissadell House, which itself is a protected structure (RPS ref. 283 CDP) and NIAH record (ref. 32400813). The closest is Ardtarmon Castle (ref. 32400704), is a national monument and fortified house. Recorded monuments on the headland to the south of the adjacent cove include a promontory fort (SMR ref. SL007-001001) and Knocklane Castle (SL007-001002). The proposal is not considered to be exceptional in the historic context of the site and the current receiving environment adjacent to other detached houses etc.
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).	Likely effects were / are limited to the construction phase through increased noise and dust from construction traffic and operations but would have been / will be substantially below the threshold of significance through established construction management practices. Having regard to the scale of the proposal there is no potential to significantly impact on environmental parameters or on the ecological sensitivities of the aforementioned European sites, including transboundary designations, or other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.
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.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 2 (AA Screening)

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Replacement dwelling, including DWWTS etc.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Generally level, 0.161ha site around 5mAOD, rising gradually to the rear to c. 6mAOD. Works, as noted, involved the demolition of a cottage and outbuildings and the construction of a replacement dwelling on a broadly similar footprint, with projection to the rear. The FFL is given as 6mAOD and involved some under-build at the lower end given the marginal slope. In this regard, I note that the cottage had a living room at 5.08mAOD and bedroom at 5.3mAOD. The previous sheds to the north are shown as 6.30mAOD. Excavations unlikely significant save for DWWTS. Boundaries, as noted, are generally undefined. Habitats can be classified as buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3) across most of the site, with concrete and stoned yard, recolonising bare ground and scrub (ED3 and WS1), treeline and scrub (WL2), hedgerow (WL1), stone walls (BL1) and earth banks (BL2) also evident. The field to the rear, where the percolation area is proposed, is horticultural land (BC2). No drainage ditches or groundwater vectors evident. Construction activities would have required/will require the use of potentially harmful materials, such as fuels, concrete and other such substances and give rise to waste for disposal. The demolition of the cottage and sheds would also have given rise to wastes etc. Noise and dust emissions during construction were / are likely but such construction impacts would be / have been localised and temporary in nature.
Screening report	Yes – ESC Environmental (May 2025)
Natura Impact Statement	No
Relevant submissions	Appellant notes that the area is a natural habitat for birds and wildlife. Applicant agrees as noted above.
Additional information	Sligo Co. Council screened out the need for AA. I note that the application was referred to An Taisce, NPWS and Uisce Éireann – no objections received.

Step 2: Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-Pathway-Receptor model

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
Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC (000627)	Marine, coastal and grassland habitats Petrifying springs Narrow-mouthed Whorl snail Sea Lamprey River Lamprey Harbour Seal Conservation Objectives Link (NPWS, 2024)	Overlaps appeal site boundary, adjoining the rear wall of the dwelling to be retained and completed.	Yes – direct ecological connection and via ground-water body.	Y
Ballintemple and Ballygilgan SPA (004234)	Barnacle Goose Conservation Objectives Link (NPWS, 2024)	c. 0.9km southeast of appeal site (from closest point)	No hydrological connection – the SPA is sufficiently remote to avoid disturbance during construction and the site is unsuitable for roosting / foraging.	N
Ardboline Island and Horse Island SPA (004135)	Cormorant Barnacle Goose Conservation Objectives Link (NPWS, 2025)	c. 1.1km south of appeal site	No – as above and in addition to a significant marine buffer.	N

Drumcliff Bay SPA (004013)	Sanderling Bar-tailed Godwit Wetland and Waterbirds Conservation Objectives Link (NPWS, 2013)	c. 3km southeast of appeal site	No – as above.	N
----------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	----------------	----------

¹Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

²Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³if no connections: N

Further Commentary / Discussion

All Conservation Objective links above are up to date at the time of writing and have been cross-referenced against the Statutory Instruments, where relevant.

Due to the limited scope of the works and the nature of the appeal site, I consider that the development proposed is unlikely to generate impacts that could extend to a large geographical area, thus a potential zone of influence (Zol) limited to c. 5km is reasonable and notwithstanding the 10km Zol as outlined in Section 3.5 of the submitted AASR.

Sources of impact and likely significant effects are considered in the Table below.

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

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests * priority habitat	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC (000627) Estuaries [1130] Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]	Direct: Limited in terms of land- take and notwithstanding the marginal overlap into the SAC. Mapping of the SAC is discussed in Section 3.2.2 of the AASR. Nearest QI [1140] >100m from works areas.	The proximity of the site gives rise to an indirect hydrological connection / pathway but given the interrupted / impeded nature of the pathway from this wider site which is largely enclosed by embankments and mature vegetation and the distance to the receiving features connected to the SAC, make

Embryonic shifting dunes [2110] Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120] Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130] <i>Juniperus communis</i> formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands [5130] Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210] Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220] <i>Vertigo angustior</i> (Narrow-mouthed Whorl Snail) [1014] <i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea Lamprey) [1095] <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> (River Lamprey) [1099] <i>Phoca vitulina</i> (Harbour Seal) [1365]	Indirect: Localized, temporary, low magnitude impacts from demolition and construction related emissions i.e., uncontrolled release of dust and other pollutants to air or to waterbodies via silt/sediment laden surface water runoff as well as increased noise and vibrations. Lower-scale magnitude impacts from emissions to surface water and groundwater during operation via storm and foul drainage systems. Resultant degradation of air and water quality has the potential to adversely impact on QIs of this SAC.	it highly unlikely that the development proposed to be retained and completed will generate (has generated) impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for QIs listed. Clean runoff incorporates SuDS measures and foul water will be directed to a new DWWTS which will be located outside the mapped area of the SAC. Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
Further Commentary / discussion (only where necessary)		

As noted, Section 3.2.2 of the AASR details the existing environment and notes that whilst the appeal site partly overlaps the Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC, the designation appears not to have followed the NPWS guidance in this regard. The AASR includes an aerial photo from 1995 and prior to the proposed SAC designation (candidacy) which shows the existing site footprint with buildings in situ. Appendix 2 of the AASR sets out correspondence from the NPWS Designations Unit. It notes that the boundary of the SAC was mapped on historic Irish Grid/six-inch maps when the site was protected in 1997 and when preparing each cSAC for formal designation it notes that the site boundary was transferred to modern ITM/1:5000 maps. It also suggests that infrastructure which pre-dates the protection of the cSAC is not included within the boundary of the SAC.

Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the development proposed to be retained and completed (alone / in combination with other plans and projects) did / would not result in likely significant effects on European sites. No further assessment is required for this project.

No mitigation measures are required to come to this conclusion.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

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 development proposed to be retained and completed individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC, or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- Information provided in the submitted AA Screening report,
- The relatively modest scale of the development within an existing brownfield site and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European site,
- Low potential for source impacts of any magnitude,
- Consideration of the conservation objectives of:
 - Cummeen Strand / Drumcliff Bay (Sligo Bay) SAC.

No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European sites were required to be considered in reaching this conclusion.

Appendix 3 (WFD Screening)

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-501186-SO-26	Townland, address	Ballyconnell Td., Ballinfull, Co. Sligo
Description of project		Replacement dwelling, including DWWTS etc.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		Generally level, 0.161ha site around 5mAOD, rising gradually to the rear to c. 6mAOD. Works involved the demolition of a cottage and outbuildings and the construction of a replacement dwelling on a broadly similar footprint, with projection to the rear. Excavations unlikely significant save for the proposed treatment system as shown in section drawing. Boundaries are generally undefined. The submitted AASR classifies habitats as buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3) surrounded by earth banks (BL2) and horticultural land (BC2) with Amenity Grassland (Improved) also present. A concrete and stoned yard, recolonising bare ground and scrub (ED3 and WS1), treeline and scrub (WL2), hedgerow (WL1) and stone walls (BL1) were also evident during my visit. No drainage ditches or groundwater vectors evident on site or identified by applicant.	

Proposed surface water details			‘Soakpit’ ticked in Q. 20 of the Application Form. This was addressed at FI stage.			
Proposed water supply source & available capacity			‘Existing’ ‘public mains’ ticked in Q. 20 of the Application Form.			
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			‘New’ ticked in Q. 20 of the Application Form. Specified as follows: <i>Tricell novo tank with tero pod on gravel percolation area.</i>			
Others?			N/a			
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	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)
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Yellow Strand IE_WE_G_0058	Good	Not at risk	None identified	Yes – free draining marine sand below proposed percolation area as detailed in the Site Characterisation Report / also via existing septic tank
Coastal Waterbody	c. 70-90m	Donegal Bay Southern IE_WE_430_000 0	High	Not at risk	None identified	Yes – tenuous overland pathway given relative proximity to HWM.

Step 2: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Ground	Yellow Strand IE_WE_G_00 58	Existing – via septic tank which is to be decommissioned. New – replacement dwelling partially constructed on concrete block foundation walls and likely involved standard excavations. Deeper excavation required for treatment system.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages. Impact on hydrological regime due to site excavation and increased ponding.	None proposed but standard construction practices anticipated.	No.	Screened out.

2.	Coastal	Donegal Bay Southern IE_WE_430_ 0000	Existing – tenuous surface water pathway overland.	Siltation, pH (Concrete), hydrocarbon spillages.	As above.	No.	Screened out.
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
1.	Ground	Yellow Strand IE_WE_G_00 58	New – stormwater pathway which will infiltrate to ground and foul drainage which will percolate to ground following treatment.	Degradation of receiving water quality.	Clean runoff incorporates SuDS measures and foul water will be directed to a new DWWTS.	No	Screened out.
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
1.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

This page is intentionally left blank.