



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501189-GC-26

Development

Retention and completion of dwelling, including removal of structurally unsound walls and foundations and minor alterations to original design granted under 24/60081 and all associated works

Location

75 Renmore Road, Galway

Planning Authority

Galway City Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2560337

Applicant(s)

Domhnall and Catherine Walsh.

Type of Application

Retention (and completion).

Planning Authority Decision

Conditional permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellants

Anne and Joanne Shaughnessy
Patrick Mullins and others.

Observer(s)

None

Date of Site Inspection

15th July 2026.

Inspector

Ann Bogan

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History	6
5.0	Policy Context	6
6.0	EIA Screening	9
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment.....	14
9.0	AA Screening	21
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	21
11.0	Recommendation	22
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	22
13.0	Conditions.....	22
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		25

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the established suburban residential neighbourhood of Renmore in Galway City and fronts onto Renmore Road. A flat roofed two storey dwelling is under construction on the site. The first floor overhangs the ground floor on either side and to the front. External and internal walls are in place but not yet rendered; roof has been constructed; and scaffolding is in place around the structure. Most windows and external doors have been installed. An opening for a window in the south-west elevation is boarded up and the window appears not yet to have been installed. No construction is underway at present and the site is fenced off.
- 1.2. There is a single storey pitched roof dwelling on the adjacent site to the south-west, No. 74 Renmore Road (first appellant), and there are two dwellings under construction on the adjoining site to north-east, No 76A and B Renmore Road. A row of two storey plus attic semi-detached dwellings, Dun Na Mara, back onto the subject site (second appellants).
- 1.3. There is a variety of dwelling types and designs along Renmore Road, with a mixture of single storey and two storey dwellings, the majority of them detached, most with pitched roofs, some dating back to the 1960s/1970s and some of recent construction and contemporary design. The road is in a period of transition with a considerable amount of construction of new and replacement dwellings underway.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Development consists of
 - Retention and completion of dwelling house including removal of structurally unsound walls and foundations. Application states that during construction walls and foundations to be retained under planning ref 24/60081 were found to be unsuitable to carry loadings from new first floor so had to be removed and reconstructed to replicate, as far as possible, form and appearance of original structure
 - Minor alterations to original design granted under planning ref 24/60081, including addition of a 'fire escape' opaque glass window in side elevation and increase in overall height of height of 250mm. The overhang at first floor level also appears to be

increased somewhat in width; this is not specifically referenced in the documentation but is on the drawings submitted.

- Construction stage demolition plan and foundation plan drawings dated June 2024 (DW24-CS-102 and 103) showing the walls it had been intended to retain under the original permission accompany the application. Drawings (DW25-PL-102 and 103) submitted show the walls which were removed, changes to foundations and installation of additional window.
- Documentation submitted by way of further information includes contextual elevational drawings and a landscaping scheme.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Grant permission subject to eight largely standard conditions relating to protection of utilities, surface water run-off, control of hours of operation etc. Of note are:

Condition 7 requires landscaping details submitted under further information to be implemented within 3 months of completion of dwelling

Condition 8 requires first floor south-western side elevation bedroom [window] shall be obscurely glazed.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Report of 10/12/2025: While points raised in third party submissions are noted, current application is for amendments to extant valid permission and proposed alterations and amendments are the subject of the Planning Authority assessment
- Considers proposed change in height to be minor but requires revised drawings to be submitted, showing the increase in height, for clarity
- Changes to separation distances from site boundaries are considered minor with minimum impact

- FI requested drawings showing proposed minor change in height, justification for window in side elevation and requiring a landscape plan to provide screening along site boundaries
- Report of 16/3/26: considers response to FI addressed points raised therein. Proposed development complies with City Development Plan and “is in keeping with the character and pattern of surrounding residential development and prevailing residential amenities of the area”
- AA Screening: due to limited nature and scale of proposed development within existing residential area and absence of connectivity to European sites, concluded no appropriate assessment issues arise and proposed development not likely to have significant effect on European sites
- EIA Screening: Due to limited nature and scale and absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in vicinity, no likelihood of significant effects on the environment and need for EIA can be excluded at preliminary examination.
- Grant of permission recommended subject to 8 conditions. Planning Authority decision to grant permission to grant is in line with recommendation.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

24 submissions/observations were received. Issues raised in summary included:

- Proposed development is out of character with the area, does not accord with Galway City Development Plan, is much larger than neighbouring properties, is higher than proposed, is overbearing and differs from what was originally proposed
- First floor overhang produces a top-heavy form that is visually obtrusive and increases overshadowing and overlooking
- Differs from what was originally proposed, with front wall closer to road and out of alignment with existing houses

- Gable to right is less than required 1.5m from neighbouring property, impacting on privacy, amenity and character of adjacent property
- First floor gable wall is extremely close to boundary wall contrary to Section 11.3.1(f) of City Development Plan
- Overhang of first floor is imposing and should not be allowed impact on 74 Renmore Road
- Shed to rear is within 1m of rear boundary wall and exceeds height exemptions for flat roofed sheds and overshadows our property
- All trees and vegetation on boundary were removed, contrary to condition No 9 of original permission resulting in loss of privacy
- Unauthorised development, undesirable precedent to grant retrospective retention permission
- New proposed window for retention overlooks entry to property next door, impacts privacy and is not a viable fire escape
- Revised plans do not include dimensions to boundaries of neighbouring boundaries.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. 24/60081 - Permission granted for development that consists of the renovation and extension of existing dwelling as follows: (a) removal of existing pitched roof and construction of new first floor accommodation with flat roof, (b) ground floor extensions to the front and rear, (c) alterations to existing elevations (d) new garden shed, (e) associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029

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

Section 3.6 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs

Potential exists in the established suburbs for smaller infill development opportunities which can enhance the diversity of house type and contribute to local character. Infill development will be required to have regard to the existing pattern of development, plots, blocks, streets and spaces and should not be of such a scale that represents a major addition to, or redevelopment of, the existing urban fabric. The protection of existing residential amenity and character is a priority but must be balanced with opportunities for sustainable high quality regeneration and appropriately scaled infill.

Such development will be required to demonstrate a positive contribution to the urban fabric, respect and contribute to existing amenity and character and deliver sustainable benefits. Similarly where replacement dwellings are proposed, the sustainable benefits must be clearly demonstrated and any such development must make a positive contribution to the area's urban fabric and amenity and character.

Policy 3.5 Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs

1. Facilitate consolidation of existing residential development and densification where appropriate while ensuring a balance between the reasonable protection of the residential amenities and the character of the established suburbs and the need to provide for sustainable residential development and deliver population targets.

Chapter 11 General Development Standards and Guidelines

Residential Development

11.3.1 Outer suburbs

11.3.1 (d) Overlooking

Residential units shall generally not directly overlook private open space or land with development potential from above ground floor level by less than 11 metres minimum

11.3.1 (f) Distance between Dwellings for New Residential Development

- The distance between side gables and side boundaries of dwellings shall generally be a minimum of 1.5 metres.
- Within all other residential developments, including apartment buildings and large dwellings, (greater than 200m²), the distance between buildings shall generally be greater unless deemed acceptable under specific site performance based criteria, this is to provide a good layout and context for the development.

11.3.2 Established Suburbs

As per standards for Outer Suburbs except:

11.3.2 (a) General

In the interests of sustainability and urban design, higher densities may be appropriate when new residential development or commercial/community development has regard to the prevailing pattern, form and density of these areas.

5.2. **Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

Specific Planning Policy Requirement SPPR 1 - Separation Distances of the Sustainable and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)

SPPR 1 - Separation Distances It is a specific planning policy requirement of these Guidelines that statutory development plans¹⁵ shall not include an objective in respect of minimum separation distances that exceed 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units or apartment units above ground floor level. When considering a planning application for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms¹⁶ at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

There shall be no specified minimum separation distance at ground level or to the front of houses, duplex units and apartment units in statutory development plans and

planning applications shall be determined on a case-by-case basis to prevent undue loss of privacy.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

Site is:

- 300m east of Inner Galway Bay SPA (004031)
- 300m east of Galway Bay Complex SAC (000268)
- 2km east of Lough Corrib SAC (000297)

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. 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 Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. (See Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

Appeal 1: Occupants of 74 Renmore Road

- Appellants welcomed previous permission as it appeared to be an extension of existing bungalow but house was not renovated and extended as permitted under Planning Ref 24/60081 but was demolished; submission re structural integrity was made after demolition
- Building is excessive in scale and very imposing on neighbouring properties and their privacy
- Application drawings for both original and retention applications do not show measurements for distance from boundary wall and south-western first floor gable, so unclear how close it is
- Addition of window in south-western gable for fire escape was not part of original plans and it overlooks front and side of appellants house, 74 Renmore Road

- Front windows should be changed to allow opening element as means of fire egress and gable window closed up
- South west gable wall is so close to boundary that only obvious route from window is into neighbouring property, subjecting appellants to liability in event of injury.

Appeal 2: On behalf of some residents of Dun na Mara

- Scale and nature of changes go far beyond minor alterations
- Application seeks to normalise non-compliance with permission granted. Granting retention would undermine integrity of planning system
- Dwelling is much larger and out of character with neighbouring houses; bulk and height create overbearing presence when viewed from neighbouring properties
- Increased height and massing results in overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight to adjacent gardens, particularly in evenings
- Significant negative impact on residential amenity (privacy, light, outlook)
- Side elevation window raises concerns re overlooking and loss of privacy, justification as fire escape questionable
- Removal of boundary vegetation contrary to condition of permission removes natural screening, resulting in loss of privacy to rear of adjoining properties in Dun na Mara
- Planting scheme proposed does not address interim loss of amenity to neighbours
- Alleges non-compliance with Development Plan Policies which require new development to respect existing character, protect residential amenity and avoid excessive scale
- Concerns re proximity of structure to site boundaries, impacting on amenity
- Plans for rear shed not included in original application; is within 1m of boundary, 3.5m in height and contributes to overshadowing and visual intrusion
- Shed is in effect an extension of the rear single storey extension of the building
- Procedures whereby it was given permission, by submitting details as compliance with a condition, gave no opportunity for neighbours to make observations

- Procedural irregularities and enforcement concerns: demolition of walls prior to structural report, continued construction despite enforcement, construction out of permitted hours
- Planning Authority conclusion that development is in keeping with character of area not supported by the evidence and fails to adequately consider impact of all deviations
- Mitigation measures of obscured glazing and landscaping are inadequate to protect amenities
- Even small height increase can have significant amenity impact in residential contexts
- More appropriate approach would have been to refuse retention permission and require development to align with original permission
- Retention application seeks to retain works that adversely affect neighbouring properties, contravene Development Plan and undermine integrity of planning system
- Request Commission to refuse permission for retention and completion of development

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

First appeal (occupants of 74 Renmore Road)

- While appellants acknowledge they had no objection to development approved under 24/60081, many of concerns raised relate not to retention items but to matters of design, scale and massing already approved and to which no objection was raised at the time
- Escape from gable window would be to side passage between subject dwelling and boundary wall and not into neighbouring property as feared by appellants.

Second Appeal (residents of Dun na Mara)

- Shed constructed to the rear has been approved by the Planning Authority in compliance with conditions of 24/60081 and is not part of scope of works for which retention is sought

- The only net changes to dwelling as constructed from that previously granted are house is 25cm higher, and the addition of first floor window which faces to public realm and is to be of opaque glazing
- Subject site is to north of appellants properties in Dun na Mara and as solar path is east to west via the south it cannot give rise to material overshadowing or loss of daylight to those properties
- In addition, dwellings in Dun na Mara are greater in height and massing than subject dwelling (9.3m high vs 6.3m high) and have side facing windows which are not obscured
- Does not accept that side window with obscured glass could result in loss of privacy or impact on residential amenity
- Removal of vegetation was dealt with by way of submitted landscaping scheme which will be implemented within 3 months of completion of dwelling
- Concerns re perceived design failures of dwelling and not respecting pattern of development in area should have been raised under original application (24/60081) and do not fall within scope of current application. No Development Plan or other standards are identified in submission to support the concerns
- Appeal raises procedural and enforcement related concerns, however no substantive evidence is submitted and these assertions are contested
- Unforeseen structural/technical requirements during construction led to limited deviations from permitted plans. Applicant seeks to regularise these through retention application. There was no deliberate disregard of planning conditions and approved plan, as alleged
- Many of concerns raised relate to matters of design, principle, scale, massing and overall development which were previously considered under 24/60081, rather than retention matters currently under consideration; house as built is substantially in compliance with plans previously granted

Justification for removed and reinstated wall sections

- Approx 80% of existing bungalow walls were to be removed in authorised works, during construction it was discovered remaining walls and existing foundations were

found not to be sufficient to ensure structural stability of building so had to be removed.

- Removed walls were reconstructed to replicate as precisely as practicable form and appearance of original structure
- Increase in height of 25cm arose from increased depth required for first floor structural build up, which could not be fully accommodated within dimensions shown on original plans
- Increase was required for structural integrity and not to materially alter scale of appearance of the approved development
- Prevailing pattern of development along this section of Renmore Road is mainly two-storey and subject house is modest in this context.

Landscaping and Planting Scheme

- Part of rear hedge was removed to allow construction of new shed. Landscaping scheme was proposed as mitigation
- Scheme will reinstate landscaping removed during construction, will include semi mature evergreen planting along site boundaries, will enhance natural screening on southern boundary and boundary treatment to improve residential and visual amenities.

Justification for additional upper floor window

- Permitted first floor windows are fixed panel windows with no openable sections. Additional window required for the right front bedroom to provide fire-escape in line with Part B Building Regulations
- Window is toward front of building line and faces the public realm only. No view to private open space on any property
- Applicants provided obscured glazing on window to ensure privacy of neighbouring property.
- Illustrations provided to show existing and emerging pattern of development nearby and along Renmore Road. States many buildings are higher than subject

dwelling and upper floor side windows are a feature of recent nearby dwellings as well as older dwellings on Renmore Road

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

7.4. **Observations**

- None

8.0 **Assessment**

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

- Principle of demolition and replacement of walls and foundations
- Impact of design changes on residential and visual amenity
- Window in side elevation
- Landscaping
- Storage shed

8.2. Introduction

8.2.1. Renmore Road is going through a period of transition in recent years. Many of the older buildings are single storey pitched roof detached bungalows, as well as some two storey dwellings. However, many of these older dwellings are being replaced by two storey dwellings of various forms. Some are of more conventional design with pitched roofs while others such as the subject dwelling, are of a contemporary design.

8.2.2. A number of the issues raised in the third party appeals address the design of the dwelling and argue that it is out of character with the area and neighbouring buildings. However, it is important to emphasise that the design of the dwelling was approved under an existing planning permission (24/60081) by the Planning Authority and the current application relates to the changes made in the dwelling as constructed from that previously permitted. It is solely these changes that fall to be considered by the Commission in the appeal process. Furthermore, enforcement issues raised in the appeals are a matter for the Planning Authority to address.

8.3. **Demolition and replacement of walls and foundations**

8.3.1. The main changes to the permitted dwelling relate to the demolition and replacement of existing walls and foundations which were shown as being retained in the parent application (24/6081). The applicants state that after the initial demolition phase it was discovered that the wall sections designated for retention were structurally unsound and “not suitable for carrying the loadings that would be imposed by the new first floor structure” and that the sections of wall removed were reconstructed to replicate as far as practicable the form and appearance of the permitted structure.

8.3.2. I note that there does not seem to have been a drawing submitted with the parent application (24/6081) explicitly showing the extent of demolition and retention, although it could be inferred from the extent of new window and door openings and the radically changed internal layout proposed. Drawings have however been submitted with the current application showing the extent of retention and demolition under the earlier application. Side walls of the original structure, short sections of the front wall and a very short section of the rear wall were to be retained. All other internal and external walls and roof were to be demolished under the permission granted.

8.3.3. Taking account of the extent of demolition granted permission already and the justification put forward for further demolition, the changing character of the area, and precedent whereby permissions have been granted for full demolition and replacement by new dwellings on other sites, including adjoining site at No 76 Renmore Road (Ref 24/60416 and 24/60417), I consider the principle of the demolition of the walls and their replacement with similar walls to be acceptable. I am satisfied it would be in keeping with Section 3.6 and Policy 3.5 Sustainable

Neighbourhoods: Established Suburbs which provide for consolidation of development and sustainable high quality regeneration and appropriately scaled infill in these areas, balanced with protection of residential amenities and character of established suburbs.

- 8.3.4. I consider the implications of the changes to the design and appearance of the structure in more detail below.

8.4. Impact of design changes on residential and visual amenity

- 8.4.1. The height of the structure is stated in the applicant's response to the appeal to have increased by 250mm over that permitted under 24/60081 as a result of the "depth required for first floor structural build up which could not be accommodated within the dimensions shown on the original drawings," bringing it to a stated overall height of 6.3m.
- 8.4.2. The contextual drawing submitted with the application (DW26-FI-001) shows the amended dwelling in the context of surrounding development in the area. Based on the submitted drawings and observation on site it is clear that the roof height of the subject dwelling is similar to the eaves level of the nearby row of recently completed dwellings at Nos 77-80 Renmore Road to the north-east and to the permitted dwellings on the adjoining site at No 76A (24/60416) and No76B Renmore Road (Ref 24/60417), which are under construction at present. The ridge height of these adjacent buildings is approximately 1.5m - 2m above the level of the overall height of the subject dwelling.
- 8.4.3. The subject dwelling is approximately 1m higher than the ridgeline of the neighbouring single storey dwelling to the south-west, (No 74 Renmore Road). The occupants of No 74 have raised concerns in their appeal in relation to the demolition of the dwelling in its entirety and what they argue is the excessive scale of the building, as constructed. They did not, however, make a submission on the original permission granted on the subject site.
- 8.4.4. The dwellings at Dun na Mara, to the south-east and rear of the subject dwelling are two storey with attic accommodation, and are positioned at a lower ground level than the subject dwelling, but have a ridgeline approximately 2m higher. In addition, the windows of the opposing structures at first floor level are approximately 29m apart.

- 8.4.5. In my opinion, taking into account the permitted height of the dwelling in the parent permission, and other development permitted and constructed in the vicinity, the increase in height of 250mm is a relatively minor alteration in the context of the scale of the building. It would not constitute a change in character from the permitted dwelling and would not lead to a significant increase in overshadowing or overlooking of nearby properties. In particular, the subject dwelling is to the north-west of the dwellings in Dun na Mara and north-east of No. 74 Renmore Road, and based on the path of the sun, the increase in height should not result in overshadowing of these dwellings. I am satisfied therefore that the increase in building height does not result in a significant adverse impact on visual or residential amenity in the area and would be in keeping with Development Plan policies.
- 8.4.6. The Local Authority planning officer's report notes minor changes to separation distances from site boundaries, as shown on the as constructed and approved drawings, arising from replacement of older walls by modern wall construction and I agree with the conclusion that these alterations are minor and have no impact the design and character of the development previously approved.
- 8.4.7. In addition to the height increase, it appears from the contextual front elevational drawing submitted and from on-site observation, that the first-floor overhang in the parent permission has also increased somewhat. It is unclear if this is linked to the structural requirements for the first floor or other factors. Dimensions of the overhang were not shown on drawings accompanying the original application (24/60081) but I estimate it projected circa 300mm over the ground floor.
- 8.4.8. In the absence of accurate dimensioned drawings, the increase in width of the overhang indicated on the contextual drawing can be estimated based on the distance from the site boundary. The dwelling as constructed is c1m from the side boundary wall with No. 74 Renmore Road at ground floor level, corresponding to the line of the side wall of the pre-existing dwelling. The contextual elevational drawing indicates the overhang extending more than halfway across this 1m passageway. Based on on-site observation, the overhang as constructed would appear to extend approximately halfway, and is therefore a minimum of c500mm wide, or c200mm wider than in the original approved design.

- 8.4.9. This change in width of the overhang increases the mass of the upper floor somewhat but in the context of the overall scale of the building, I consider it has a relatively minor impact on the visual appearance of the structure and would not impact on the character of the area. It does however bring the upper level of the structure closer to the nearest dwelling, No 74 Renmore Road.
- 8.4.10. In that context, Section 11.3.1 (f) of the Galway City Development Plan states that “the distance between side gables and side boundaries of dwellings shall generally be a minimum of 1.5 metres”. In this case, the pre-existing dwelling was just over 1m from the shared boundary with No 74 and this is reflected in the location of the side wall of the building granted permission under 24/60081, which also permitted a c300m overhang. I note no objection was raised to the overhang at the time by neighbouring residents. The principle of the overhang was approved in the parent permission, and while bringing the structure closer to the neighbouring dwelling is undesirable, I believe the limited increase in width as constructed, would not result in a significantly increased adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property that would have pertained under the parent permission.
- 8.4.11. In conclusion I am satisfied, that taking into account that the principal of the building design has been established under the permission already granted, the changes in design as considered above are acceptable and compatible with the Galway City Development Plan policies for the area.
- 8.4.12. Issues associated with the additional window in the side elevation are addressed below.

8.5. Window in side elevation

- 8.5.1. As indicated in the application, the additional window serving a first-floor bedroom, is positioned in the side elevation (south-west), close to the front of the dwelling. It overlooks the front garden, gable wall and driveway of No 74 Renmore Road. There are no windows in the gable of No 74 and the window does not overlook private areas or open space serving the dwelling. The applicants also propose that the window will be constructed of opaque glass. I note also that there are other examples of recently constructed dwellings in the area where side windows at first floor level are present.

- 8.5.2. In this case there are no opposing overlooking windows serving habitable rooms at first floor level and the outlook is not onto private open space, therefore SPPR1 – Separation Distances of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines (2024) does not apply. As it does not overlook private areas or windows of the adjoining property, I am satisfied that the positioning of a window in this location would not impact significantly on residential amenity of the neighbouring property.
- 8.5.3. I note the justification for the window is to achieve Building Regulation Compliance (Part B Fire) as the large window to the front of the dwelling has no opening sections to facilitate escape in event of fire. The appellants raise concerns as to the suitability of the additional window as an escape route, due to its proximity to their adjoining property. However, assessing compliance with Building Regulations is outside the remit of the Commission in considering this appeal. It falls to the developer to ensure compliance with Building Regulations, including taking account of any implications of the width of the overhang, proximity to the boundary wall with the neighbouring property and other relevant factors.

8.6. Landscaping proposals

- 8.6.1. The appellants have raised concerns regarding the removal of existing vegetation along site boundaries “eliminating natural screening that previously protected adjoining properties” particularly those in Dun na Mara, in contravention of condition of No 9 of 24/60081, which required existing boundary walls and planting to be retained, and they are concerned that the proposed planting will take time to replace previous mature planting. The applicants state that removal of existing planting along the rear boundary was necessary to construct a garden shed.
- 8.6.2. The landscaping plan submitted on foot of a further information request includes two-layer screen planting along the rear boundary, made up of 2m high mature evergreen hedging, and pleached holly trees at a higher level. Hedging is also proposed along the south-west side boundary and on both side boundaries of the front garden. I consider the overall landscaping scheme to be acceptable and am satisfied that the proposed planting along the rear boundary, in conjunction with the 29m distance between the upper floor windows of the subject dwelling and the properties at Dun na

Mara, will provide adequate levels of privacy and protect the residential amenity of those properties.

8.7. Domestic shed

- 8.7.1. Issues have been raised by the appellants in relation to a flat roofed domestic storage shed which has been constructed in the form of a further extension of the single storey section to the rear of the main dwelling structure. Concerns were expressed in relation to the height of the shed, proximity to the wall, overshadowing of neighbouring properties and the process under which it was approved.
- 8.7.2. Condition No 2(i) of 24/60081 stated that prior to commencement of development revised drawings shall be submitted of the new garden shed for the written agreement of the Planning Authority. The shed is not referenced in the development description of the current application. Drawing number DW26-FI002, submitted with the current application, illustrates the side elevation of the dwelling to be retained in the context of the adjoining bungalow, also shows what is labelled as 'Domestic shed add on' and states that it is in compliance and references an approval letter from Galway City Council. In the response to the appeal, the applicant's agent confirms the shed is not part of the scope of works for which retention permission is sought. The letter to the applicants from Galway County Council dated 13th May 2025, which accompanies the applicant's response to the appeal, states that the details of the shed submitted in compliance with the condition were acceptable and that Condition 2(i) was deemed to be complied with.
- 8.7.3. The storage shed and adjoining single storey part of the dwelling have been constructed, but external finishes and garage door have yet to be completed. The flat roofed storage shed aligns with the roof height of the single storey section to the rear of the dwelling and the proposed finish of the shed is proposed to match the adjoining structure. The storage shed will be largely screened from properties in Dun na Mara by the proposed 2m hedge and by existing planting in the immediately adjoining neighbouring properties in Dun na Mara. It is unlikely to have a significant negative impact on amenities of adjoining properties.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the development in the light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is 30m east of Inner Galway Bay SPA, 300m east of Galway Bay Complex SAC and 2km east of Lough Corrib SAC. The development comprises the retention and completion of a dwelling house including removal of structurally unsound walls and foundations and minor alterations to original design.
- 9.2. No nature conservation issues were raised in the planning appeal.
- 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 would not have any effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Nature of the works i.e. small scale and nature of the development
 - Location and distance from nearest European Site and lack of connections
- 9.4. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on a 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. The subject site is located at Renmore Road in Galway City and the nearest waterbody is inner Galway Bay/Lough Atalia. The development comprises the retention and completion of a dwelling house including removal of structurally unsound walls and foundations and minor alterations to original design. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 10.2. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and groundwater water bodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am

satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.3. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of the development
- The distance from nearest water bodies and lack of hydrological connections

10.4. I conclude on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development 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 water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. Grant permission for retention and completion subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the changes to the development to be retained and completed, which are considered relatively minor in nature relative to the development permitted under Planning Ref 24/60081 and to the revised landscaping plan submitted, the pattern of development in the area and the provisions of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029, it is considered that, subject to compliance with conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual or residential amenity of the area or of property in the vicinity and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 13th February 2026 and 27th 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 prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity

2. Apart from any departures authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission, Ref 24/60081, unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission.

3. The dwelling shall be used as a single dwelling unit only.

Reason: To protect the residential amenities of the area.

4. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent flooding or pollution.

5. Any alterations to public services, public areas or utilities necessitated by the development shall be carried out at the developers' expense having firstly obtained the agreement in writing of the Planning Authority or other public bodies responsible for such areas or utilities, before any alterations are carried out.

Reason: In the interest of public safety.

6. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements for "Site Development Works for Housing Areas" as issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government unless required otherwise by the Planning Authority in which case the Planning Authority standards shall apply.

Reason: In the interest of public safety

7. The developer shall ensure that all demolition/construction activity within this site shall comply with the following:
- a. All demolition/construction activity shall be restricted to between 0800 hours and 1800 hours Monday to Friday and between 0900 hours and 1300 hours Saturday, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority. No works shall take place on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays.
 - b. All wastes arising from the development shall be disposed of by suitably licenced service provider to a suitably licensed facility.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity

8. The landscaping scheme submitted to the Planning Authority on the 13th of February 2026 and 27th February 2026 shall be carried out within 3 months of the date of the completion of the dwelling or within the first planting season, following substantial completion of external construction works. Upon completion the planting scheme shall be certified by a qualified landscape architect. Any trees/planting failing within the first three years shall be replaced.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

9. The first floor south elevation bedroom window shall be obscurely glazed.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity

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.

Ann Bogan
Planning Inspector

21 July 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501189-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	The development comprises the retention and completion of a dwelling house including removal of structurally unsound walls and foundations and minor alterations to original design
Development Address	75 Renmore Road, Galway City
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ 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.	State the Class here
☒ 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	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☐ 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)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
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: Ann Bogan _____ Date: 21/07/2026 _____