



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report PL-501374-GY-26

Development	To construct a private dwelling house, domestic garage, a proprietary effluent treatment system, and ancillary site development works.
Location	Liss, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam Co. Galway
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660018
Applicant(s)	Colin Treacy & Eimer Garvey
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Sean Hehir
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	13 th July 2026
Inspector	Emma Gosnell

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 Natural Heritage Designations	13
7.0 EIA Screening.....	13
8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening	13
9.0 The Appeal	14
10.0 Assessment.....	16
11.0 Recommendation	24
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	24
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 2 – AA Screening Determination (Forms 1 & 2)	
Appendix 3 – Screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment Determination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located in the townland of Liss c. 1.6km to the south-east of the rural village of Abbeyknockmoy, c. 25km to the north-east of Galway City. The site is fronts the Lisch Road (L7138) which has a 60kmph speed limit and is accessed from same by means of an agricultural gate on its north east-side. The L7138 leads to the N63 national road c. 1.5km further to the north.
- 1.2. The site is bordered to the north and west by an agricultural field, with the access gate to this field being located to the immediate north-east. To the south the site is adjoined by a detached bungalow set on a large plot, with mature trees along its northern boundary. The wider area is rural in character, relatively low lying and features a mix of agricultural farmland and one-off housing, typically detached single storey and dormer bungalows, with the majority of the existing housing at this location being located on the opposite (east) side of Lisch Road.
- 1.3. The rectangular site, which has a stated area of c. 0.320ha, comprises of a gently sloping agricultural field. It is enclosed on its west and north sides by post and wire fencing with further wire fencing and mature trees and hedging along its southern boundary. A c. 70m expanse of old stone wall and mature hedgerows (which are separated from the carriageway from a narrow grass verge) form the site's roadside boundary, with telecom poles and wiring spanning above and across this boundary.
- 1.4. There are no Protected Structures, archaeological remains or recorded monuments on the site. It is not identified on the NIAH and does not form part of an Architectural Conservation Area. It is also not proximate to any protected views or scenic routes.
- 1.5. The appeal site is not in the ownership of the applicants and a letter of consent (dated 25/11/2025) from the owner (who is identified as John Paul Lane) to apply for planning permission is provided with the application.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of the construction of a single storey 3-bed, T-shaped dwelling house (c. 160sq.m) with pitched and monopitch roofs (to a max. height 5.63m). It also comprises the construction of a single storey domestic garage (24sq.m) on the south-west side of the proposed dwelling, a proprietary effluent

treatment system, soakpit and all associated siteworks including in-curtilage parking and hardscaping.

- 2.2. No changes to the nature or extent of the proposal were made at Further Information (FI) stage.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Permission granted on 28/04/2026 subject to 15 no. conditions, generally of a standard technical nature. Conditions of note were as follows:

- **No. 2** – restriction on use and occupancy of the house for a period of 7 years.
- **No. 3** – (a) and (c-f) clarification on permitted materials and finishes and (b) details of proposed cladding to be agreed with PA.
- **No. 7** – (b) overhead lines and poles shall be set back in line with the new fence at the developer's expense before work commences on the development.
- **No. 8** – any new front boundary shall be of local, unplastered natural stone or native hedgerow species and shall not exceed 1 meter in height.
- **No. 13** – (c) Any in-situ stonewalls, hedgerow and/or trees bounding the site shall be retained, except for the provision of the site entrance works/sight distance triangles.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

2 no. planning reports formed the basis of the planning authority's (PA) assessment:

Planner's Report (dated 02/03/2026) - Initial Application Stage

Points of note in the report include:

- **Principle of Development** – further documentary evidence re: rural housing need (birth cert, land registry folio details and site location maps demonstrating family

land holdings) required due to site's location in RH 2 Rural Housing Zone 2.

Further Information Recommended.

- **Design** – height, scale, design, materiality and visual impact of house & garage generally acceptable and in accordance with the design guidelines for single rural houses.
- **Access** – satisfied that layout plan shows required 70m sightlines can be achieved.
- **Water Supply** – Uisce Eireann Confirmation of Feasibility submits states that public mains have adequate capacity to service proposal.
- **Wastewater** – PA satisfied that WWTS proposal is in compliance with EPA CoP.
- **Drainage** – surface water management via soakpit is acceptable. To be conditioned.
- **AA Screening** – proposal not likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000 site(s) on account of its nature, scale and the absence of pathway(s) to same.
- **EIA Screening** – No EIA required due to nature, scale and location of proposal.

A request for Further Information (FI) issued on 02/03/2026 in relation to 1 no. item.

The applicant's response to the FI request was received on 01/04/2026 and consisted of documentation in connection with the substantiation of the applicant's rural housing need.

The response was not determined to be significant and did not require readvertising.

Planner's Report (dated 23/04/2026) – Further Information Stage

Points of note in the report include:

- **FI Item 1 (Proof of Rural Housing Need)** – PA satisfied that the submitted birth certificate of the applicant, land registry details for the applicant's family home and the existing family landholding's proximity to the subject site and additional supporting documentation demonstrated the applicant's rural housing need as per DM Standard 7 of GCDP.

Report concluded by recommending that permission be granted as per Section 3.1.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

None on file - the application was referred to the Oranmore Area Office however no response/ report was subsequently received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No referrals were made.

3.4. Third Party Observations

A third party submission was received from Sean Hehir (dated 14/01/2026). This raised the following issues:

- Proposal's adverse impact on the operation of the observer's farm (adjoining site).
- Concerns regarding fluvial flood risk arising from servicing arrangements on site.
- Road safety on account of its geometry and visibility.
- Excessive rural housing density at this location and cumulative visual impact.
- Obstruction of scenic views including Knockroe Hill.
- Nighttime light pollution.
- Construction disturbance.
- Impact on barn owl and long eared owl breeding areas.

4.0 Planning History

4.1. Appeal Site

There is no known planning history on the site.

4.2. Neighbouring Lands

There is no recent or relevant planning history in the vicinity of the site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy and Technical Guidance

Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (First Revision, 2025) – NPO28: siting and design criteria for rural housing.

Climate Action Plan (2024 & 2025) and National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030 – Outcome 2A protection of existing designated areas & protected species.

Our Rural Future: Rural Development Policy 2021-2025.

TII DN-GEO-03060 (Geometric Design of Junctions) (2023).

EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (2021).

Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities Best Practice Guidelines for Delivering Homes and Sustaining Communities (DoHLGH, 2007).

Development Management Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoEHLG, 2007).

Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (DoHLGH, 2005).

5.2. Regional Policy

Northern & Western Regional Assembly Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy 2020-2032 – RPO 3.3: Deliver at least 20% new housing in rural areas on brownfield sites and RPO 3.4 To support the regeneration and renewal of small towns and villages in rural areas.

5.3. Development Plan

The Galway County Development Plan 2022 - 2028 (GCDP) applies.

Zoning/ Landscape

Maps 4.1 (Rural Area Types) and 4.2 (Rural Housing Policy) identify the site as being located in RH 2 Rural Housing Zone 2 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GCTPS-Outside Rural Metropolitan Area Zone 1) and also in Zone 4 – Landscape Sensitivity Category 1.

Maps 8.1 (Landscape Character Areas) and 8.2 (Landscape Sensitivity) identify the site as coming within the 'Central Galway Complex Landscape' and having a Class 1 'Low' landscape sensitivity which is unlikely to be adversely affected by change.

Appendix 4: Landscape Character Assessment - Maps 08 (View Points) and 09 (Scenic Routes).

Rural Settlement Strategy

Section 4.6 (Rural Housing Strategy in the Open Countryside).

Section 4.6.1 (Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Pressure- Metropolitan Area and GCTPS). In this rural area type, the key objectives of the Council are:

- To facilitate the genuine housing requirements of the local rural community (rural generated housing), subject to satisfactory site suitability and technical considerations;
- To direct urban-generated development to areas for new housing development in the adjoining urban centres, towns identified in the metropolitan area and the towns and villages as identified in the Settlement Strategy;
- To support rural housing in areas designated as structurally weak areas;
- To accommodate residential development proposals in accordance with Chapter 15 Development Management Standards.

In areas outside the metropolitan area, the areas under urban pressure, the Applicant will be required to demonstrate an established a substantiated Rural housing need.

Section 4.6.3 (Rural Housing Development Strategy 2022-2028) - Rural Housing Zone 2: Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GCTPS.

PO RH2 - Rural Housing Zone 2 (Rural Housing Zone 2: Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure-GCTPS): It is policy objective to facilitate rural housing in this rural area under strong urban pressure subject to the following criteria:

1 (b) Those applicants who have no family lands, or access to family lands, but who wish to build their first home within the community in which they have long standing demonstrable economic and or social Rural links* or Need and where they have spent a substantial, continuous part of their lives i.e. have grown up in the area, schooled in the area or have spent a substantial, continuous part of their lives in the area and have immediate family connections in the area e.g. son or daughter of longstanding residents of the area. Having established a Substantiated Rural Housing Need*, such persons making an application on a site within an 8km radius of their original family home will be accommodated, subject to normal development management. To have lived in the area for a continuous seven years or more is to be recognised as a substantial, continuous part of life and also as the minimum period required to be deemed longstanding residents of the area. Documentary evidence shall be submitted

to the Planning Authority to justify the proposed development and will be assessed on a case by case basis.

2. An Enurement condition shall apply for a period of 7 years, after the date that the house is first occupied by the person or persons to whom the enurement clause applies.

Definitions applied above:

***Rural Links** For the purpose of the above is defined as a person who has strong demonstrable economic or social links to the rural area and wishes to build a dwelling generally within an 8km radius of where the applicant has lived for a substantial continuous part of their life. To have lived in the area for a continuous seven years or more is to be recognised as a substantial, continuous part of life and also as the minimum period required to be deemed longstanding residents of the area.

***Substantiated Rural Housing Need:** Is defined as supportive evidence for a person to live in this particular area and who does not or has not ever owned a house/received planning permission for a single rural house or built a house (except in exceptional circumstances) in the area concerned and has a strong demonstrable economic or social need for a dwelling for their own permanent occupation. In addition, the applicants will also have to demonstrate their rural links as outlined above.

DM Standard 7: Rural Housing - In order to substantiate a rural housing need the following documentation will be required:

- Justification for location as proposed;
- Land registry maps and associated documentation;
- Proof of local connection to an area;
- Any other details that may be deemed necessary at time of application by the Planning Authority.

Rural Dwelling/ Garage Design

PO RH9 - Design Guidelines: It is a policy objective of the Planning Authority to have regard to Galway County Council's Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House with specific reference to the following:

- a) It is the policy objective to encourage new dwelling house design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape;
- b) It is the policy objective to promote sustainable approaches to dwelling house design and encouraging proposals to be energy efficient in their design and layout;
- c) It is the policy objective to require the appropriate landscaping and screen planting of proposed developments by using predominately indigenous/local species and groupings.

Section 15.2.2 (Applicable to All Development), PO DM Standard 1: Qualitative Assessment - Design Quality, Guidelines and Statements.

Section 15.3.1 (Rural Housing) and Appendix 5 (Galway Design Guidelines for the Single Rural Houses).

Section 15.2.4 (Other Residential Development (Rural and Urban)).

Appendix V (Design Guidelines for the Single Rural House).

DM Standard 6: Domestic Garages (Urban and Rural):

- The design, form and materials should be ancillary to, and consistent with the main dwelling on site;
- Structures may be detached or connected to the dwelling but should be visually subservient in terms of size, scale and bulk;
- Storage facilities should be used solely for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and not for any commercial, manufacturing, industrial use or habitable space in the absence of prior planning consent for such use.

DM Standard 8: Site Selection and Design - Apply the following guidance in assessing planning applications for rural housing:

Site Selection and Design

- The scale, form, design and siting of the development should be sensitive to its surroundings and visually integrate with the receiving landscape.
- Simple design forms and materials reflective of traditional vernacular should be used.
- Have regard to the scale of surrounding buildings. A large house requires a large site

to ensure effective integration into its surroundings (either immediately or in the future, through planned screening

- The design, siting and orientation of a new dwelling should be site specific responding to the natural features and topography of the site to best integrate development with the landscape and to optimise solar gain to maximise energy efficiency.
- The siting of new development shall visually integrate with the landscape, utilising natural features including existing contours and established field boundaries and shall not visually dominates the landscape. (Cutting and filling of sites is not desirable).
- New buildings should respect the landscape context and not impinge scenic views or skylines as seen from vantage points or public roads.
- Larger houses (e.g., in excess of 200sqm) should incorporate design solutions to minimise visual mass and scale e.g. sub-divided into smaller elements of traditional form to avoid bulky structures.
- Use a simple plan form to give a clean roof shape – a long plan in preference to a deep plan. This will avoid the creation of a bulky shape.
- Clustering with existing rural buildings is generally preferable to stand-alone locations.

DM Standard 11: Landscaping - 'Landscaping proposals should be submitted with all planning applications for development and shall include a schedule of indigenous native plant species and implementation timeline'.

DM Standard 47: Field Patterns, Stone Walls, Trees and Hedgerows - field patterns and associated stone walls, trees and hedgerows are an important part of the visual and environmental quality of rural areas and their removal and replacement with block walls and fencing leads to urban features in a rural environment. It can also have an effect on wildlife and lead to the removal of valuable hedgerows upon which wildlife depends. New developments will accordingly be subject to the following requirements in this regard:

a) Existing Features

Retain and incorporate existing field patterns and associated stone walls, trees and hedgerows into new development layouts wherever feasible.

b) Intervention

In general, only the minimum interference with existing field patterns, stone walls, trees and hedges shall be permitted.

c) Planting

The Council will also encourage the planting of native trees and hedgerows along all boundaries.

d) Hedgerows

Include consideration of native hedgerow with post and rail fencing along roadside frontages where existing hedgerow is being removed. Employ the appropriate management methods for the maintenance of roadside habitats to minimise damage (in particular to hedges) and observe the hedge cutting closed season.

Water Servicing

PO WS 7 – Water Quality: Require that new development proposals would ensure that there would not be an unacceptable impact on water quality and quantity including surface water, ground water, designated source protection areas, river corridors and associated wetlands.

PO RH 11 – Waste Water Treatment Provision: Where a connection to the public wastewater network is not available, provide for sustainable rural housing in the county in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice: Wastewater Treatment Systems for Single Houses (2009).

PO WS 8 – Proliferation of Septic Tanks: Encourage the use of high standard treatment plants to minimise the risk of groundwater pollution.

PO DM Standard 38: Effluent Treatment Plants – single houses & certification.

PO WW 6 – Private Wastewater Treatment Plants: Ensure that private wastewater treatment plants, where permitted, are operated in compliance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment System 2021 (Population Equivalent ≤ 10).

POs WW 7 – Sustainable Drainage Systems & 8 – Storm Water Infrastructure.

DM Standard 9 - Site Sizes for Single Houses Using Individual On-Site Wastewater Treatment Systems: min. site size of 2000sq.m.

Access/ Traffic Safety

PO DM Standard 28 - Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads and Table 15.3 – 90m measured a minimum distance of 2.4m from the edge of the Carriageway for a design speed of 60kmph.

6.0 Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or adjoining any designated site.

The nearest European Sites in close proximity to the appeal site are as follows:

- Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) – c. 1.5km to the north.
- Monivea Bog SAC (Site Code 002352) – c. 6.8km to the south-east.
- Lough Corrib SPA (Site Code 004042) – c. 20km to the west.
- Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004031) – c. 22km to the south-west.
- River Suck Callows SPA (Site Code 004097) – c. 30km to the east.

The nearest Natural Heritage Area in close proximity to the appeal site is as follows:

- Killaclogher Bog NHA (Site Code 001280) – c. 3km to east.

7.0 EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 & Form 2 in Appendix 1 of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposal 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 required.

8.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

I have concluded, 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 (refer to form in Appendix 3 for details).

9.0 The Appeal

9.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third-party appeal submission was received on 21/05/2026 from Sean Hehir. The grounds of appeal (GOA) are as follows:

- **Siting** – more suitable alternative site is available across the road.
- **Overdevelopment** - existing concentration of rural housing in vicinity & cumulative visual impact.
- **Road Safety** – issues raised regarding adjoining road geometry.
- **Water Pollution** - fluvial flooding and sewerage issues in the vicinity of the site on account of topography and underlying geology. Proposal will exacerbate risks to appellant's lands.
- **Farming** - negative impact of proposal on ability to farm adjoining lands.
- **Biodiversity** - negative impact of proposal on existing local wildlife – barn owl's nesting in vicinity of the site.

9.2. Applicant Response

The applicants' response to the appeal, received 10/06/2026, can be summarised as follows:

- No new issues raised in grounds of appeal.
- Applicants' connection to locality is emphasised.

The response is accompanied by a further letter from the applicants' engineer (dated 10/06/2026) which seeks to respond to the technical points raised in the grounds of appeal as follows:

- **Siting** – the suitability of the application site only should be assessed and alternative sites that may/ may not be available are not a relevant consideration.

The PA were satisfied as to the suitability of the subject site for the development proposed.

- **Overdevelopment** – concerns are not supported by technical evidence nor planning policy. Proposal for an appropriately serviced one-off house is in-keeping with established settlement pattern. Additional single house does not have potential to materially impact on local services or infrastructure capacity etc.
- **Water Pollution/ Farming** – design of proposed WWTS is EPA CoP compliant and this was confirmed by the PA. Continuing compliance will be ensured by condition. No evidence has been put forward regarding alleged local sewerage leakage issues and standard surface water management condition will ensure all run-off managed on site. No evidence to suggest proposal will impact water quality, wildlife or local farming activities.
- **Biodiversity** – no technical evidence provided in support of appellant's claims that subject site supports protected species, and site does not form part of an SAC, SPA or NHA. Proposal seeks to minimise removal of natural heritage features and to provide additional native planting and landscaping. Proposal on account of its nature and scale has no potential to adversely affect biodiversity.
- **Road Safety** – proposal provides for a 4m wide vehicular access and for sightlines of 70m in both directions. Access arrangements were acceptable to PA and a condition can be attached ensuring adequate visibility is maintained in perpetuity. There is no evidence to suggest proposal would give rise to a traffic hazard.

9.3. Planning Authority Response

None received.

9.4. Observations

None received.

9.5. Further Responses

None received.

10.0 **Assessment**

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, 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:

- Rural Housing Need
- Siting and Design
- Access and Boundaries – New Issue
- Water Pollution
- Biodiversity
- Other
 - Farming of Land
 - Protected Views
 - Water Supply
 - Overhead Power Lines
 - Landscaping

10.1. **Rural Housing Need**

- 10.1.1. The applicants have submitted a range of documentation to substantiate their rural housing need. These documents include a letter from the local Newtown national school confirming attendance during the period 1998 – 2006 inclusive; insurance letters dating from period 2019-2024; 2017 & 2018 Revenue documentation; 2025 HSE documentation; and, 2026 letters of support from a local Councillor and a TD for Galway East - all addressed to Colin Treacy at his family home at Farmhill, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam. Information is also provided as to the exact location and legal ownership of the applicant's family home – which is located in the immediate area and in close proximity to the appeal site.
- 10.1.2. Having reviewed the aforementioned documentary evidence, I am satisfied that the applicants' have sufficiently substantiated their rural housing need under DM Standard

7: Rural Housing which requires, at a minimum, the provision of a justification for the proposed location, land registry maps and associated documentation and proof of a local connection to an area.

10.1.3. However, I draw the Commission's attention to the fact that the site is located in Rural Housing Zone 2 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure) where housing proposals are governed by Sections 4.6.1 (Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Pressure-Metropolitan Area and GCTPS) and 4.6.3 (Rural Housing Development Strategy 2022 - 2028) and Policy Objective Rural Housing Zone 2 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure – GCTPS - Outside Rural Metropolitan Area Zone 1).

10.1.4. Section 4.6.1 seeks to facilitate the genuine housing requirements of the local rural community (rural generated housing), subject to satisfactory site suitability and technical considerations. Section 4.6.3 and PO RHZ2 seek to facilitate rural housing in rural areas under strong urban pressure subject to a number of mutually exclusive criteria (a-e) and an enurement clause. In the case of the proposal subject of this appeal, it is criteria 1(b) which applies. Its constituent requirements are considered as follows:

Those applicants who have no family lands, or access to family lands

10.1.5. Whilst the applicant's original family home is located on the opposite side of Lisch Road and within 8km of the appeal site. The documentation on file – including the letter of consent from a third party - indicates that there is no family lands available to satisfy their rural housing needs.

Who wish to build their first home within the community in which they have long standing demonstrable economic and or social Rural links or Need and where they have spent a substantial, continuous part of their lives...*

10.1.6. As detailed in paragraphs 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 above, I am satisfied that it has been demonstrated that the applicant (Colin Treacey) has lived in the area for a continuous period in excess of seven years and is therefore a longstanding resident with the required social rural links to the area (immediate family connection). I am also satisfied that the site subject of the proposal comes within a radius of 8km of where the applicant has lived for a substantial continuous part of their life.

10.1.7. The policy guidance goes on to state that, where the applicant's housing need has been substantiated (as per the above), such persons will be accommodated, subject to normal development management considerations.

10.1.8. Therefore, having regard to the specific policy objectives which apply to the lands, I consider the proposal for a new rural dwelling on the lands to be acceptable in principle under the terms of the development plan subject to the detailed considerations below.

10.2. Siting and Design

10.2.1. The appellant has raised an issue in principle with the siting of the proposal and argues that a more suitable alternative site is available for development on the opposite side of Lisch Road. I consider that the suitability of alternative sites to accommodate the proposal falls outside the scope of the appeal before the Commission which concerns the subject site only. Notwithstanding, the appellant has raised relevant related issues regarding overdevelopment and cumulative visual impact.

10.2.2. Firstly, in respect to the matter of overdevelopment and excessive amount of rural housing at this location, I note that the subject site is located on the west side of Lisch Road and adjoins a single bungalow, with no other housing being located in the immediate vicinity on this side of the road and no potential to exacerbate existing ribbon development. Whilst a number of one-off houses are located on the opposite side of the road, I consider the overall pattern of development exhibited at this location to be a form of rural clustering which is appropriate to its context. It is my view that the addition of a further rural house at this location, on the west side of the road, will serve to spatially balance and visually consolidate this existing pattern of development.

10.2.3. Secondly, with regard to the concerns raised regarding cumulative visual impact, I note that the proposal is located in a rural area which is classified as having low landscape sensitivity and as being unlikely to be adversely affected by change. I also note that the PA were satisfied in respect to the layout, scale, height and design character of the proposed dwelling and considered that it would visually assimilate into its rural landscape as required in compliance with DM Standard 8 - Site Selection and Design and PO RH9 - Design Guidelines.

10.2.4. Having considered the detail of the proposal, and specifically its general design, single storey nature and horizontal emphasis, I do not consider that the appellant's concerns regarding visual impact are sufficiently justified. However, I am not entirely satisfied

that the design and form of the dwelling's proposed roof profile is in compliance with DM Standard 8 - Site Selection and Design which seeks the use a simple plan form to give a clean roof shape. I recommend to the Commission that the monopitch roof above the dwelling's south (bedroom) wing is revised by condition to provide for a pitched roof to visually harmonise with that of the east (siting room) wing and to ensure better visual integration with the receiving landscape.

10.3. Access and Boundaries – New Issue

- 10.3.1. The appellant raises concerns regarding safe access and egress from the site on account of the vertical and horizontal geometry of the public road which slopes downwards from south to north where it adjoins the site.
- 10.3.2. The applicant draws the Commission's attention to the proposal for a 4m wide vehicular access and the achievement of 70m sightlines in each direction from same which they argue can be ensured in perpetuity by condition.
- 10.3.3. The Lisch Road adjoining the site is a local road where a speed limit of 60kmph applies. Table 15.3 and PO DM Standard 28 (Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads) require sightlines of 90m (measured a minimum distance of 2.4m from the edge of the carriageway) to be provided in the case of roads with a design speed of 60kmph.
- 10.3.4. Having regard to my inspection of the appeal site and the nature and alignment of the adjoining road, I am satisfied that sightlines of 90m are achievable in both directions from the proposed entrance. However, I note that, to achieve same, it is likely that a substantial portion of the existing roadside boundary (stone wall and mature hedging) would need to be removed to facilitate the provision of the required sightlines.
- 10.3.5. I consider that the stone wall and hedgerow that lines the eastern boundary of the appeal site are features which provide an important contribution to the visual and environmental quality of this rural locality. However, there is no plan on file which illustrates the nature of the existing or proposed roadside boundaries and no details are available with regard to the proposed extent of removal of the old stone wall and mature hedging which adjoin the road at this location. Given the inadequacy of information on file in this regard, it is my view that it cannot be demonstrated that the proposal is in compliance with DM Standard 47: Field Patterns, Stone Walls, Trees and Hedgerows which seeks to retain and incorporate existing field patterns and

associated stone walls, trees and hedgerows into new development layouts wherever feasible and states that, in general, only the minimum interference with existing field patterns, stone walls, trees and hedges shall be permitted. Furthermore, whilst I note conditions No's 8 and 13 attached to the PA's grant of permission, having regard to the guidance set out under the Development Management guidelines I am not satisfied that this is a matter is capable of being satisfactorily addressed by condition.

10.4. Water Pollution

- 10.4.1. Issues in respect to localised fluvial flooding and sewerage leakages are raised as part of the grounds of appeal, with the appellant raising concerns that the proposal will exacerbate same and negatively impact on their lands.
- 10.4.2. The appellant has not provided any further information to substantiate their concerns regarding flooding or water quality, and I note that no concerns regarding same were raised by the PA, Uisce Eireann or other parties in the course of the assessment of the application.

Surface Water Management

- 10.4.3. There are no watercourses in the immediate vicinity of the site which is located within Flood Zone C.
- 10.4.4. The applicant proposes to manage all surface water run-off within the confines of the appeal site by way of a surface water soakpit that is designed in accordance with BRE Digest 365 design guidance. This soakpit will be located on the south-east side of the site within the front garden and will be sited over 10m from the nearest neighbouring property. Having regard to the siting and design of the proposal's surface water management infrastructure, I am satisfied that there is no potential for it to give rise to fluvial/ surface water flooding on neighbouring lands. Furthermore, I note that the site's surface water management proposals were acceptable to the PA and I am of the view that there is adequate information before me to demonstrate that surface water on the site can be adequately managed and disposed of. In light of the foregoing considerations, I am satisfied that the delivery of the proposed infrastructure to the required standard can be ensured by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Wastewater

- 10.4.5. In respect to the management of foul water on site, the applicant proposes a secondary wastewater treatment system and soil polishing filter which would be sited on the north-east side of the dwelling. A Site Characterization Form (SCF) supported by geological maps, photographical evidence of the trial hole and percolation test holes, information on the selected wastewater treatment system including manufacturing, technical details and construction specifications for the proposed effluent disposal have been submitted with the planning application. Having reviewed this information, the PA were satisfied that sites subsoil characteristics are capable of disposing wastewaters generated in compliance with EPA CoP.
- 10.4.6. In considering the proposal, GCDP POs WS 7 (Water Quality), WS 8 (Proliferation of Septic Tanks), DM Standard 38 (Effluent Treatment Plants), WW 6 (Private Wastewater Treatment Plants), RH 11 (Waste Water Treatment Provision) and DM Standard 9 (which requires a min. site size of 2000sq.m where use of an individual on-site wastewater treatment system is proposed) are all relevant as they seek to protect water quality and to ensure that that private wastewater treatment systems for individual rural houses comply with the EPA's Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (PE <10) (EPA 2021).
- 10.4.7. I have reviewed the submitted Site Suitability Assessment report, which indicates the aquifer category as being Regionally Important (RI) and having an 'Extreme' groundwater vulnerability classification. The Groundwater Protection Response Category is identified as 'R2₂' which is detailed in Table E1 (Response Matrix for DWWTSs) of the EPA Code of Practice (CoP) as being *"Acceptable subject to normal good practice and the following additional condition: 1. There is a minimum thickness of 2 m unsaturated soil/subsoil beneath the invert of the percolation trench of a septic tank system OR 2. A secondary treatment system as described in Chapters 8 and 9 is installed, with a minimum thickness of 0.3 m unsaturated soil/subsoil with percolation values from 3 to 75 (in addition to the polishing filter, which should be a minimum depth of 0.9m"*. I note from the cross section submitted that a minimum unsaturated subsoil depth of c. 0.9m will be provided for as required by the CoP's Table 6.3: Minimum unsaturated soil and/or subsoil depth requirements. The average P-test subsurface value of 10.69 is also in the percolation value range provided for in the CoP's Table 6.4: Percolation Values.

10.4.8. In light of the foregoing, I am of the view that there is adequate information before me to demonstrate the proposal's design compliance with the EPA Code of Practice: Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (2021) and I am satisfied that the proposed WWTS is suitable for this site and would not give rise to water pollution or to a public health risk. I am also satisfied that the delivery of the proposed infrastructure to the required standard can be ensured by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

10.5. Biodiversity

10.5.1. The GOA outlines concerns regarding the negative impact of the proposal on existing local wildlife, with barn owls, bats and hedgehogs being specifically mentioned in this regard. The appellant's concerns in this regard are strongly refuted by the applicants who are of the view that the appellant has provided no technical evidence in support of their claims that subject site supports protected species.

10.5.2. It is stated in the appeal that a pair of barn owls nested in the vicinity of the site. However, no details are provided in respect to the location of this nest, and I note that as the appeal site itself is devoid of suitable features (i.e. buildings or trees etc.) for owl nesting.

10.5.3. The potential impact of the proposal on bats is also raised. However, I consider that whilst there may be some potential for the mature hedgerow to the front of the site to be used for incidental bat foraging, there are no suitable roosting features (buildings or trees etc.) on the site. Furthermore, the proposal does not propose to interfere with the mature trees (on the neighbouring property) which adjoin the site to the south.

10.5.4. Similarly, in respect to hedgehogs, I note the existence of a hedgerow lining the eastern boundary of the site. As detailed in Section 10.3 of this report, I have outlined concerns with regard to proposed works to this boundary.

10.5.5. The appellant raises the issues of construction stage and light spillage in the context of local wildlife. I consider that the construction phase of the project and the operational domestic lighting that would emanate from the proposal would be in-keeping with that of the existing rural housing and would not be out of character with same, with no potential to adversely affect local wildlife on this basis.

10.6. Other

Farming of Land

- 10.6.1. The appellant raised the matter of the proposal's likely adverse impact on the operation of their adjoining farm at application and appeal stage. This concern appears to arise from issues relating to fluvial flood risk and water pollution/ servicing arrangements which I have dealt with in Section 10.4 of this report.

Protected Views

- 10.6.2. The potential of the proposal to obstruct scenic views, including that of Knockroe Hill to the north of the site, was raised as an issue at application stage. I am satisfied that the proposal does not have the potential to obstruct scenic views on the basis that it is not located proximate to any protected views or scenic routes (as per Maps 08 (View Points) and 09 (Scenic Routes) of plan Appendix 4: Landscape Character Assessment) and cannot therefore impinge on same.

Water Supply

- 10.6.3. I consider that the proposal, on account of its nature, size and proposed occupancy levels, would not give rise to significant additional demand for potable water.
- 10.6.4. The applicants are proposing to source their potable water from a new connection to the public mains. An Uisce Eireann Confirmation of Feasibility (dated 30/09/2025) in respect of the proposal is submitted with the application. This states that the proposed water connection is feasible without requiring an infrastructure upgrade. On this basis, I am satisfied that the proposal is capable of being adequately serviced.

Overhead Power Lines

- 10.6.5. As detailed in Section 1.0 of this report, there are overhead power lines and associated poles located along the site's roadside boundary. The PA were satisfied that these could be repositioned within the site at the developer's expense prior to commencement of development. Given the nature and siting of the existing overground cables, their separation from the proposed dwelling and the overall scale of the appeal site, I consider it reasonable that their relocation be addressed by condition where the Commission are minded to grant permission.

Landscaping

- 10.6.6. PO RH9 (Design Guidelines) requires appropriate landscaping and screen planting of proposed developments and the use of predominately indigenous/local species and

groupings whilst DM Standard 11 (Landscaping) states that landscaping proposals should be submitted with all planning applications for development and shall include a schedule of indigenous native plant species and implementation timeline. Whilst the applicants' response to the appeal states that the proposal seeks to minimise removal of natural heritage features and to provide additional native planting and landscaping, I consider that, overall, inadequate details have been provided with regard to scheme landscaping proposals. Having regard to the substantive reason for refusal, I do not recommend that this issue form the basis for a refusal of permission in this instance.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that permission be REFUSED for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The location of the new entrance to the proposed development is directly onto the L7138 (Lisch Road) at a location where a speed limit of 60 kmph applies. Inadequate information has been provided in respect to the proposed extent of works to, and removal of, the existing stone wall and mature hedgerow which form the site's eastern roadside boundary and, as such, the impact of the provision of 90m sightlines required in compliance with Table 15.3 and PO DM Standard 28 – (Sight Distances Required for Access onto National, Regional, Local and Private Roads) cannot be properly assessed with regard to compliance with DM Standard 47: Field Patterns, Stone Walls, Trees and Hedgerows of the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Emma Gosnell
Planning Inspector
19th August 2026

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501374-GY-26
Proposed Development Summary	To construct a private dwelling house, domestic garage, a proprietary effluent treatment system, and ancillary site development works.
Development Address	Liss, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam Co. Galway.
	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)	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure – dwelling units – 500 units. Proposal is to provide 1 no. dwelling unit and is therefore sub-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: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501374-GY-26
Proposed Development Summary	To construct a private dwelling house, domestic garage, a proprietary effluent treatment system, and ancillary site development works.
Development Address	Liss, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam Co. Galway.
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).	The proposal is for a one-off single storey rural house (c. 160sq.m) on a site of 0.320ha and there are no demolition works involved. The development is significantly below the class threshold of 500 dwellings. Whilst there is rural housing in the immediate vicinity, it is relatively dispersed in character and not atypical for such an area. The project due to its size and nature would not give rise to significant use of natural resources or production of waste during either the construction or operation phases.

	The proposed development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, and is not vulnerable to climate change.	
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 site is located in a rural area in the vicinity of Abbeyknockmoy village and there is similar low-density rural housing in the wider area. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) – c. 1.5km to the north and Monivea Bog SAC (Site Code 002352) – c. 6.8km to the south-east, with all other sites being over 20km away. There are no watercourses on or in the immediate vicinity of the site, with the nearest being c. 1.6km to the north. The site is located in Rural Housing Zone 2 (Rural Area Under Strong Urban Pressure GCTPS-Outside Rural Metropolitan Area Zone 1) and in Zone 4 – Landscape Sensitivity Category 1 (Low). There is no other nationally designated site, scenic route or protected view on or in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. The site is not within a designated ACA and there are no Protected Structures or other cultural heritage sites on or immediately adjoining the site. Having regard to the above and the nature and limited scale of the proposed development, I am satisfied that impacts on environmental sensitivities can be adequately assessed in this case without the need for EIA.	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Due to the relatively small scale of the development, the site enabling and construction stages will not be significant in terms of duration or complexity. The main operational impacts would be limited to traffic safety, visual amenity, surface water and the wastewater arising from the site. These elements would be subject to standard assessment/ design, I am satisfied that this can be assessed without potential for significant environmental effects that would require EIA. There would be no significant cumulative impacts with other projects.	
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 - Appropriate Assessment Screening

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics Case file: PL-501374-GY-26	
Brief description of project	Normal planning appeal. To construct dwelling house and domestic garage, wastewater treatment system and associated siteworks at Liss, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam, County Galway – see Section 2.0 of Inspector's Report for further details.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The appeal site, which is located in the rural townland of Liss, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam, County Galway, comprises of a rectangular agricultural field, set within a larger agricultural field, which fronts Lisch Road to the east. Some site clearance/ enabling works (creation of an access ope etc. and relocation of overhead wires) are required in order to facilitate the proposal. The development involves the construction of a new one-off detached rural house and domestic garage, together with ancillary works. Proposed water supply is via the public mains with capacity having been demonstrated. The applicant proposes to dispose of their surface water run-off via a soakpit in the front garden (south side) that will discharge to groundwater. Foul drainage will be dealt with via a new secondary WWTP (septic tank and polishing filter) which will discharge to groundwater – full details in Section 10 of Inspector's Report. There are no watercourses or other ecological features of note on the appeal site that would connect it directly to European Sites in the wider area. The Abbert River (EPA Code IE_WE_30A010300) is located c. 1.6km to the north of the site, with this watercourse flowing in a south-westerly direction and overlapping with the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297). It is considered that, given the intervening distance and bank of agricultural land, rural housing and local & national roads between the site and this river, there is no potential for it to provide a hydrological connection to the aforementioned European sites. However, the appeal site is underlain by the Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code IE_WE_G_0020) which also underlays the nearby Lough Corrib SAC and this therefore provides a potential indirect hydrological link between the appeal site and these European sites. There is considered to be no pathway to any other Natura 2000 sites in the vicinity of the appeal site due to the nature and relatively

	small scale of the development, the location of the appeal site relative to other European sites and the substantial separation distances involved which would give rise to significant intervening dilution effects.			
Screening report	No			
Natura Impact Statement	No			
Relevant Submissions	No			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
Having regard to the source-pathway receptor-model, I consider that there is 1 no. European site which has the potential to be affected by the proposal. I have excluded all other European sites on the basis of their substantial physical separation from the appeal site and due to the absence of realistic pathways connecting the appeal site to same.				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological Connections ²	Consider further in screening ³
Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297)	Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains (Littorelletalia uniflorae) [3110] Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Littorelletea uniflorae and/or Isoeto-Nanojuncetea [3130] Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation of Chara spp. [3140] Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculion fluitantis and Callitricho-	c. 1.5km	Yes Potential indirect hydrological connection via WWTP and soakpit emissions to groundwater	Yes

	Batrachion vegetation [3260] Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210] Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils (Molinion caeruleae) [6410] Active raised bogs [7110] Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration [7120] Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion [7150] Calcareous fens with <i>Cladium mariscus</i> and species of the <i>Caricion davallianae</i> [7210] Petrifying springs with tufa formation (Cratoneurion) [7220] Alkaline fens [7230] Limestone pavements [8240] Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0] Bog woodland [91D0] <i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i>			
--	--	--	--	--

	(Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029] Austropotamobius pallipes (White-clawed Crayfish) [1092] Petromyzon marinus (Sea Lamprey) [1095] Lampetra planeri (Brook Lamprey) [1096] Salmo salar (Salmon) [1106] Rhinolophus hipposideros (Lesser Horseshoe Bat) [1303] Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] Najas flexilis (Slender Naiad) [1833] Hamatocaulis vernicosus (Slender Green Feather-moss) [6216] Source: NPWS website accessed 23/07/2026.			
--	--	--	--	--

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

AA Screening matrix

Site Name	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297)	Direct: none Indirect: potential indirect hydrological connections via WWTP and soakpit	The contained nature of the site (relatively defined site boundaries, no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SAC make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for the QIs listed in the table above at either construction or operation stage.

	emissions to groundwater	In terms of emissions to water, the nearest watercourse is the Abbert River (EPA Code IE_WE_30A010300) which is located c. 1.6km to the north of the site at its nearest point. With such an intervening distance, it is considered that there is no physical or functional connection between the appeal site and this watercourse and therefore no potential for this watercourse to act as a hydrological pathway to any European sites. The site is also underlain by the Clare-Corrib groundwater body groundwater body which also underlays Lough Corrib SAC which is located c. 1.5km from the appeal site. Notwithstanding the proposed surface water and foul water arrangements, with such a distances, any silts or other potential pollutants entering groundwater via unattenuated run-off at construction stage or via the proposed surface water system or the proposed WWTP during the operational stage, even in the most extreme scenarios, would be completely attenuated by the dilution, dispersal and settlement that would occur within the groundwater system. There is therefore no prospect that materials carried in surface water drainage or foul water from the proposed development site, could have any significant effect on the QIs of the aforementioned European site. 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	
Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site I conclude that the proposed development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not result in likely significant effects on a European Site. No measures specifically intended to avoid or reduce harmful impacts of the proposed development on European sites were taken into account in reaching 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 proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites.		

namely Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) in view of that site's Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature and relatively minor scale of the development.
- Distance from and weak indirect connections/ ecological pathways to the European sites.

Appendix 3

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	PL-501374-GY-26	Townland, address	Liss, Abbeyknockmoy, Tuam, County Galway
Description of project		The proposal comprises of the construction of a dwelling house and domestic garage, wastewater treatment system and associated siteworks – see Section 2.0 of Inspector's Report for further details.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site is located on agricultural field in the townland of Liss, Abbeyknockmoy in Co. Galway. Located in Flood Risk Zone C. No watercourses on site. The nearest watercourse is the Abbert River (EPA Code IE_WE_30A010300) which is of Good Status and Not At Risk and is located c. 1.6km to the north of the site. This river flows in a south-westerly direction and overlaps with the Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297). The appeal site is also underlain by the Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code IE_WE_G_0020) which is also of Good Status and Not At Risk.	
Proposed surface water details		Surface water will discharge to a newly constructed soakpit in the front garden of the dwelling - See Section 10.0 of Inspector's report for further details.	

Proposed water supply source & available capacity			Proposed connection to public mains is supported by letter evidencing capacity and feasibility - See Section 10 of Inspector's report for further details.			
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues			Secondary treatment system and polishing filter proposed in front garden - See Section 10.0 of Inspector's report for further details.			
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)
Abbert River (transitional)	1.6km	Abbert River (030) (EPA Code IE_WE_30A0 10300)	Good	Not At Risk	n/a	No direct pathways. No indirect pathways.
Clare-Corrib groundwater body (groundwater)	Below site	EPA Code IE_WE_G_00 20	Good	Not At Risk	n/a	Yes – foul and surface water discharges.
Step 4: 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	Water body 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.	Surface	Abbert River (030) (EPA Code IE_WE_30 A010300)	No	n/a	n/a	No	Screened Out
2.	Ground	Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code IE_WE_G_0020)	No	n/a	Best practice construction measures.	No	Screened Out

OPERATIONAL PHASE							
4.	Surface	Abbert River (030) (EPA Code IE_WE_30 A010300)	No	n/a	n/a	No	Screened Out
5.	Ground	Clare-Corrib groundwater body (EPA Code IE_WE_G_0020)	Yes – new via WWTS and soakpit discharges	Water pollution	Best practice design and system installation. Compliance with EPA Code of Practice.	No	Screened Out
DECOMISSIONING PHASE							
N/A							

