



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501210-MO-26

Development	Dwelling house, garage, septic tank system and percolation area, and all associated works.
Location	Speck, Charlestown, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660101
Applicant(s)	Niall Murphy & Roisin Kearns
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Mr Sean Regan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	12 th June 2026
Inspector	Kathy Tuck

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site which has a stated area of 0.438ha is situated within the townland of Speck, Charlestown, Co Mayh. The site is located c.2.56km to the south-east of Charlestown and access is provided from the L5338.
- 1.2. The eastern boundary of the site is shared with an existing bungalow dwellings while the northern and western boundary is formed with lands which appear to be in use for agricultural purposes.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is being sought for the provision of a bungalow dwelling with a floor area of c.228sqm and ridge of c. 5.6m.
- 2.2. The proposal also includes for the provopn a garage with a stated area of c.32sq.m, a new waste water treatment plant and associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Plannign Authority issued a decision to grant planning permission on the 30th March 2026 subject to 10 no. conditions. Conditions of note are as follows:

Condition no. 2

The finished floor level of the dwelling shall be at 98.800m as shown on the site layout plan submitted to Mayo County Council on 9th February 2026.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and development

Condition no. 10

Section 48 Development Contribtution - €4,650.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer dated the 25th March 2026 sets out details of the site location, the proposed development, the planning history pertaining to the appeal site and wider area, details of relevant planning policy, a summary of consultee reports and submissions received, and sets out an EIA, AA and Flood Risk Assessment.

The assessment considered that the proposed development was acceptable and concluded that permission be granted in line with the decision issued.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

MD Engineer: Request that applicant shall remove roadside ditch and set back roadside boundary for the full extent of the site in order to maximise sightlines to the west. All utility poles shall be removed from setback area

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Transport Infrastructure Ireland – states that it will rely on the planning authority to abide by official policy in relation to development on/ affecting national roads, as outlined in the DoECLG Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012).

3.4. Third Party Observations

Section 6 of the Planners report provides a summary of the 1 no. observation received which raises the same concern as the grounds of this appeal.

4.0 Planning History

There is no planning history pertaining to the appeal site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Relevant National/ Regional Policy and Ministerial Guidelines

- National Planning Framework First Revision, April 2025
- Northern & Western Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2020-2032 (RSES)

- Sustainable Rural Housing Development Guidelines, 2005
- EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) (2021)

5.2. Mayo County Development Plan

The relevant plan is the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028, including Variation no. 1, hereafter referred to as MCDP. The following sections are most relevant:

The subject site is located in landscape policy area 4 and in the rural area and in an area which in location within an area under strong urban influence.

5.2.1. Chapter 3 Housing

Section 3.4.8 Rural Single Housing

Objective RHO 2:

“In rural areas not classified as in Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence, there is a presumption in favour of facilitating the provision of single housing in the countryside, based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, except in the case of single houses seeking to locate along Mayo’s Scenic Routes Scenic Routes with Scenic Views or Coastal Areas/Lakeshores”

Housing Objective RHO5

“To advise all rural housing applicants to utilise the Design Guidelines for Rural Housing (Mayo County Council) and core principles of same.”

5.2.2. Chapter 10 Natural Environment Policies:

NEP 1: To support the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural heritage and biodiversity of County Mayo, including the protection of the integrity of European sites, that form part of the Natura 2000 network, the protection of Natural Heritage Areas, proposed Natural Heritage Areas Ramsar Sites, Nature Reserves and Wild Fowl Sanctuaries (and other designated sites including any future designations). Objectives:

NEO 6: To protect surface waters, aquatic and wetland habitats and freshwater and water- dependent species through the implementation of all appropriate and relevant Directives and transposed legislation and seek to protect and conserve the quality,

character and features of inland waterways by controlling developments close to navigable and non-navigable waterways. 5.2.3.

Volume 2 of the GCDP contains Development Management Standards.

5.2.3. Section 2.0 refers to Rural Residential Development.

Section 2.3 Site size. Section 2.4 Vehicular Access. Section 2.5 Building Line. Section 2.6 Landscaping and Boundary Treatments. Section 2.8 Rural Housing Garages/Sheds. Section 2.10 Effluent Treatment Systems. Section 2.11 Water Supply. Section 2.12 Surface Water. Section 2.13 Occupancy Clause.

Section 7.6 Access Visibility Requirements.

Section 12.1 12.1 Natural Heritage Designations and Biodiversity

5.2.4. Map based objectives

There are no map-based objectives affecting the site. The site is outside Areas of Strong Urban Influence, and outside any Scenic Route or Protected View. The site is within Landscape Protection Policy Area 4 where rural dwellings are considered to have low potential to create adverse impacts on the existing landscape character.

5.2.5. Mayo Rural Housing Design Guideline 2008.

5.4 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not situated within or directly abutting any Natura 2000 sites. The appeal site is situated c.1.85km to the east and 1.7km to the south of the River Moy SAC (SAC 002298).

6.0 EIA Screening

The scale of the proposed development does not exceed the thresholds set out by the Planning and Development Regulations 2000 (as amended) in Schedule 5, Part 2(10), and I do not consider that any characteristics or locational aspects (Schedule 7) apply. I conclude that the need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required. Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 of my report refers.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a 3rd Party appeal against the decision of the Planning Authority to grant planning permission. The grounds can be summarised as follows:

1. Site Location and Design

- Disputes comments of Planning Officer with regard to location of dwelling.
- Resided at location since 1980.
- Point 8 of Planning Officers report – reference to RH02
 - Question if criteria was met in terms of Mayo Rural Design Guidelines.
 - Siting and Design
 - Grant of permission opens adjacent land for further development.
 - Sets an undesirable precedent for ribbon development.
 - Contrary to proper planning and sustainable development of the rural area.
 - Land Ownership
 - Appears to be existing cottage on land – more appropriate location.
 - Family owns extensive land bank – more suitable site may have been available.
 - Therefore – More intensive search of family land holding should have been undertaken.
 - House Design
 - Not in keeping with Mayo Rural Design Guidelines which recommends reducing dwelling into smaller forms.
 - Access
 - Will give rise to an increase in traffic movements and traffic hazard with limited site visibility.

2. Boundary Treatment

- Planning Officer had total disregard for comments from 3rd party Observation
 - Requested access to views which have been in existence.
 - Outlook at new hedging will add to distress.

7.2. Applicant Response

The applicant in response to the 3rd party appeal notes the following:

Cover letter from applicant notes and demonstrates that they are a long-standing member of the community by including a letter from national and secondary school and letters from local GAA and Soccer Club. The letter also sets out current occupation of applicant and their involvement in the family farm operations.

The response also includes for a letter from the agent which can be summarised as follows:

1. Site Layout and design

- A thorough review of family land undertaken.
- Concluded appeal site most appropriate in terms of layout for solar gain/natural protection from elements/integrates into landscape.

Siting/closet building

- No evidence/precedent that development will open adjacent for development
 - Would require further permission.
- Dwelling is neatly clustered with adjacent buildings which include:
 - Dwelling and garage – 38m to the south/east.
 - Dwelling and farm buildings – 97m to south/east.
 - Dwelling and farm buildings – 100m to the east.
- In accordance with Mayo County Council Development Plan and National Policy – dwellings should be clustered with existing development.

Land Ownership

- Land Ownership – 2025 survey undertaken of family landholdings.

- Derelict dwelling identified – survey indicated not structurally capable of renovation (survey included in appeal response).
- Replacement at same location not possible due to requirement of a new roadway of c.190m.

House Design

- Appeal site already in applicants' ownership.
- Housing designed in accordance with Mayo Rural design guidelines.
- H-Shaped creates smaller form – common and advocated by Planning Authority.
- Modest height of 5.6m with a shallow gable depths of 6m as per Section 3 of the Rural Design Guidelines.
- Finished floor level lower than that of appellants by c.2.15m.

Access

- Access- via the L5338 with posted speed limit of 60km/ph.
- Site lines of 90m required in both directions as per Section 7.6 of Volume 2 of the County Plan.
- Average speed limit on L5338 due to vertical and horizontal alignment.
- Traffic numbers very low
- Requirements of Development Plan considered to be onerous on rural roads.
- Design speed survey undertaken in accordance with TII Guidance (DN-GEO-03031) which indicates that:
 - 50m sightlines are achievable and acceptable to the west and 90m to the east are achievable.

2. Boundary Treatment

- Proposed boundary treatment is compliant with Rural Housing Guidelines and section 2.6 of volume 2 of the County Development Plan.

- Original submission offered support for development and requested dwelling be relocated 4m to north and planting be omitted from the eastern boundary.
- Proposed site layout plan indicates contours of the appeal site and adjacent dwelling – indicates appellants finished floor level and ridge height higher than proposed.
- No automatic right to views – however proposal does not impede any.
- No issues of overlooking however removal of boundary eliminates this.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

7.4. Observations

None received.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

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

- Site layout and Design.
- Vehicular Entrance.
- Boundary Treatment.

8.2. Site Layout and Design

- 8.2.1. The principal concern raised by the appellant in this instance related to the overall design of the proposed development, compliance with the Mayo Rural Design

Guidelines and the impact the proposal will have upon existing views. While the appellant contends that the proposal does not comply with the Mayo Rural Housing Guidelines, I note that no evidence has been provided to as why or how it fails to comply. The dwelling has been situated on the appeal site in a manner which allows it to maximise solar gain and avoids any requirement to alter the natural topography of the site.

- 8.2.2. From review of the Site Layout Plan submitted together with undertaking a site visit, I accept the comments made by the applicant and note that the dwelling as proposed will sit c. 2m lower than that of the appellants dwelling. There is no existing scenic routes or views within the vicinity of the site that the dwelling could impede upon. As such I consider that the proposal complies and is in keeping with section 1 of the Rural guidelines.
- 8.2.3. The dwelling as proposed is formed by two main mirrored sections which are finished with pitched roof profiles and joined together by a central link. It can be described as being H shaped in form with a maximum ridge level of c.5.6m. The dwelling has been set back c.46m from the front boundary of the appeal site and is centralised between the eastern and western boundary of the site. I consider that the form proposed is in keeping with the 'Irish Vernacular' as set out in section 3.2 of the Rural guidelines. In addition, there is adequate separation distance between the proposed dwelling and that of the appellants which is c.36m at its closest point to the east of the appeal site.
- 8.2.4. I note that the Planning Officer addressed the concerns raised by the 3rd party observer within their assessment and provided for an adequate response to the request to have the dwelling relocated on site, which I consider to be the correct approach in this instance.
- 8.2.5. Overall, in conclusion I consider that the proposed dwelling complies with the Mayo Rural Housing Guidelines, will not give rise to any negative impact upon the existing residential amenities of the surrounding area and will not set an undesirable precedent for a similar type of development.

8.3. **Traffic Safety**

- 8.3.1. The applicant has demonstrated that a Design speed survey undertaken in accordance with TII Guidance (DN-GEO-03031) which indicates that 50m sightlines

are achievable and acceptable to the west. Sightlines to the west are achievable in accordance with Section 7.6 of Volume 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- 8.3.2. I consider that the roadway, while narrow, is capable of accommodating traffic from one additional dwelling. I note that the MD Engineer was satisfied regarding the safety of the proposed entrance and that a drawing of sightlines was submitted. A condition regarding same was attached to planning. In the event that the Commission uphold the decision of the Planning Authority, I recommend that the condition be retained.

8.4. Boundary Treatment

- 8.4.1. The appellant contents that the boundary proposed along the eastern boundary does not accord with the Mayo Rural Guidelines and would impede upon the current level of visual amenities.
- 8.4.2. The eastern boundary of the appeal site is currently formed by mature planting and hedgerow which is sparse at a point where the appellants property is situated. The proposal includes for the provision of native planting along all boundary to supplement the existing features which would accord with the 'planting generally' section of the rural housing guidelines (pg 9).
- 8.4.3. Overall, I consider the proposed boundary treatment to be acceptable and in accordance with the Mayo Rural Housing Guidelines. In addition, I consider it will add some level of screening of the proposal from both the L5338 and the neighbouring property.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. 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 proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the River Moy SAC (Site Code 002298), or any other European site, in view of the Conservation Objectives of those sites and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

9.2. This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites.
- Taking into account screening determination by Planning Authority.

9.3. See Appendix 3 of this report for Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination. No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European sites were required to be considered in reaching this conclusion

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. The subject site is situated at Speck Charlestown County Mayo. The application is seeking permission to construct a proposed new dwelling house, garage, septic tank system and percolation area, complete with all associated works.

10.2. The Lecarrow River is situated c.277.94m to the west of the site which has a good status. The site is also situated within the Kilkelly Charlestown groundwater catchment which has a good status.

10.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground 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.

10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works regard the scale;
- Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and/or lack of hydrological connections.

10.5. I conclude that 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

I recommend permission be granted.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site outside of Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence, the existing development adjacent, and having regard to the modest scale of the proposed development and its positioning in relationship to the adjacent property, it is considered that, subject to conditions, the proposed development would not significantly detract from the rural character of the area, or the amenities of the adjoining property and would be in accordance with the provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 and with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted to Mayo County Council on 9th February 2026 except as amended by Conditions hereunder.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and development.

2. The finished floor level of the dwelling shall be at 98.800m as shown on the site layout plan submitted to Mayo County Council on 9th February 2026.

Reason: In the interests of proper planning and development.

3. The existing roadside boundary shall be removed over the entire site frontage and a new boundary wall shall be erected and set back a minimum distance of 3.5 metres from the nearside edge of the tarred carriageway. The area between

the new wall line boundary and the carriageway shall be excavated out, filled, levelled and made suitable for parking motor vehicles. Roadside drainage shall be maintained at all times. Setback area to be drained by gullies and piped to soakaway. All utility poles shall be removed from setback area.

Reason: To accommodate future road improvement works and in the interest of proper drainage and traffic safety.

4. No surface water shall be discharged from the site onto the adjoining public road or any third party property. Surface water shall be discharged to soakways on site.

Reason: To avoid flooding.

5. (a) The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application on 26th June 2025 and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent $\leq$ 10) " – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

(b) Treated effluent from the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area/ polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent $\leq$ 10)" – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

(c) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution

6. If ESB lines cross the site, the developer shall inform the ESB of the intention to start work and arrange for diversions of the lines, if necessary.

Reason: To avoid electrocution.

7. The house shall be finished in nap plaster or dash with no colour components. Roof slates/tiles shall be blue black dark in colour. No brick shall be permitted as a finish to any part of the dwelling. Any quoin detailing shall be omitted. The window frames shall be finished in timber effect, powder coated aluminium or other suitable agreed finish. No white uPVC shall be permitted. Front door shall be of simple design. Gutters, fascia and eaves details shall be dark in colour.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

8. The applicant shall plant native hedging at all site boundaries and further planting behind the front wall, save at the entrance where adequate sight visibility shall be retained. Such planting shall be carried out in the first planting season following commencement of development and shall be maintained. Any unsuccessful or damaged specimens shall be replaced. All existing hedgerows and trees shall be maintained. No hedgerow or trees shall be removed during bird nesting season.

Reason: to assimilate development on this site into the area, in the interests of visual amenity and proper planning and development.

9. The garage shall be used only as a private domestic shed and shall not at any time be used for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes or converted for human habitation.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

10. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development

Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

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

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.

Kathy Tuck

Planning Inspector

22nd July 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501210-MO-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construct a proposed new dwelling house, garage, septic tank system and percolation area, complete with all associated works.
Development Address	Speck Charlestown County Mayo
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.
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	
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	S. 5 P.2 10(b)(ii) construction of more than 500 dwelling units.
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: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501210-MO-26
Proposed Development Summary	To construct a new dwelling house, garage, septic tank system and percolation area, complete with all associated works.
Development Address	Speck Charlestown County Mayo
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).	Permission is sought for the provision of a dwelling on a site situated at Speck Charlestown County Mayo. Water connection will be provided from a group water scheme at Kilmovee Upper and it is proposed to provide for a new treatment system to rear of established field boundary. The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants
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	There are no significant sensitivities in the immediate area. There is no direction connection from the subject site to any Natura 2000 sites. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other rural developments. There are no other locally sensitive environmental sensitivities in the vicinity of relevance.

reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	
Conclusion	
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required. Include the following paragraph under EIA Screening (a separate heading) in the Inspectors report.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 3

AA Screening Determination

Appropriate Assessment: Screening Determination (Stage 1, Article 6(3) of Habitats Directive)

I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The proposed development comprises the construction of a detached dwelling house and all associated works including re-configuration of the private open space of an apartment approved under pl ref: 03/4232 at Caherroyan , Sli an Chlairin, Athenry.

The Planning Authority, within their assessment, undertook a screening determination of the proposed development and found that significant effects are not likely to arise, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects that will result in significant effects to any Natura 2000 area. It was concluded that a full Appropriate Assessment of this project is therefore not required.

European Sites

The proposed development site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any site designated as a European Site, comprising a Special Area of Conservation or Special Protection Area (SPA).

The boundary of the nearest European Site is within 15 km or 1 no. of European sites are located within a potential zone of influence of the proposed development. These are:

- River Moy SAC (SAC 002298)

There are no direct natural hydrological connections from the subject site to any Natura 2000 Sites.

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 proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the River Moy SAC (SAC 002298) or any other European site, in view of the Conservation Objectives of those sites and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site.
- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites.
- Taking into account screening determination by Planning Authority.

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