



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL-501427-GY-26

|                              |                                                    |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Development                  | for a farm road                                    |
| Location                     | Highfield , Kilconnell , Ballinasloe Co.<br>Galway |
| Planning Authority           | Galway County Council                              |
| Planning Authority Reg. Ref. | 2660092                                            |
| Applicant(s)                 | Joe Carty                                          |
| Type of Application          | Permission                                         |
| Planning Authority Decision  | Refuse Permission                                  |
| Type of Appeal               | First Party Normal Planning Appeal                 |
| Appellant(s)                 | Joe Carty                                          |
| Observer(s)                  | None                                               |
| Date of Site Inspection      | 27 August 2026                                     |
| Inspector                    | Sandra Eapen                                       |

## Contents

|                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 Site Location and Description .....         | 3  |
| 2.0 Proposed Development .....                  | 3  |
| 3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....           | 4  |
| 3.1. Decision .....                             | 4  |
| 3.2. Planning Authority Reports .....           | 4  |
| 3.3. Prescribed Bodies .....                    | 6  |
| 3.4. Third Party Observations .....             | 6  |
| 4.0 Planning History .....                      | 6  |
| 5.0 Policy Context .....                        | 6  |
| 6.0 EIA Screening .....                         | 9  |
| 7.0 The Appeal .....                            | 9  |
| 7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....                    | 9  |
| 7.2. Planning Authority Response .....          | 10 |
| 7.3. Observations .....                         | 10 |
| 8.0 Assessment .....                            | 11 |
| 9.0 AA Screening .....                          | 14 |
| 10.0 Water Framework Directive .....            | 15 |
| 11.0 Recommendation .....                       | 15 |
| 12.0 Reasons and Considerations .....           | 15 |
| Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening .....      | 17 |
| Appendix 2: WFD Impact Assessment Scoping ..... | 20 |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject application is made in relation to a rural farm located at Kilconnell , Ballinasloe Co. Galway. The site is located to the south of Local Link Road L3413 Northbrook, that runs between Aughrim and R348 to Kilconnell. The application site area is stated as 0.21ha in the application documentation and only includes the area impacted by the proposed works. A Blue line, showing the extent of the landholding, is not indicated on the submitted Site Location Map denoting the total lands in applicant's control. However, the information provided at Further Information stage indicate that the applicant controls surrounding agricultural land measuring a total of c.26.85 ha.
- 1.2. The subject site consists of agricultural lands mainly used for grazing cattle. The entrance to the site is via an existing agricultural entrance and holding pen located c.100m south of the L3413 junction with R348 going to Kilconnell. The sight visibility lines available at the entrance are impacted by the height and extend of existing hedgerow bounding L3413 along the east and west directions. The application site is traversed by an open stream Kilconnell Stream (EPA Code 26K20). Ground levels are undulating within the site.

**Commented [MM1]:** Say that there is no blue line on the site location drawing, showing the extent of the farm. However, information supplied at Further Information indicates that the farm extends to 26.85 ha.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The applicant has proposed to construct c.482m of farm road, c.4.25 m wide. The proposed road extends in a northeast to southwest direction from the proposed entrance off the L3413 road. There are open surface water bodies (drainage ditches) traversing the site which would be intercepted by the proposed development. Details provided indicate that the road will have unmetalled finishes with 50mm fine gravel material placed on top of subsoil. As per the submitted information a bailey bridge/truss bridge is being proposed for the crossings. Details of which are not included in the application documentation. The adjoining lands consisting of agricultural lands used for grazing will not be affected by the proposed works.

**Commented [MM2]:** Describe the necessity to cross the two streams and that submitted photographs indicate that a bailey bridge is proposed

### 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

#### 3.1. Decision

A decision to refuse permission was made by the Planning Authority on 29 April 2026

*1. Having regard to the proposed agricultural development, and its location adjacent to an open stream, the applicant has not submitted satisfactory justification for the proposed development at this sensitive location. The Planning Authority cannot confirm that the principle of the proposed development is completely necessary and acceptable in principle at this location. Therefore, to grant permission as proposed at this location would not be considered sustainable development.*

*2. The Planning Authority has serious concern regarding the lack of detail submitted for the proposed river crossing and road construction aspects of the proposed development and lack of requested detail on drainage aspects of the design. Concern regarding impact of the proposed development on the adjacent open streams due to lack of detail regarding construction and environment management is outstanding. If permitted as proposed the development would materially contravene Policy Objective MEQ 2 Protection of the Environment and Policy Objective WR 1 Water Resources. Therefore, to permit the development as proposed, would contravene materially Policy Objectives contained in the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

#### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

##### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. The first report dated 19 March 2026 note that the applicant has provided insufficient information on the proposed works and recommended further information to be requested on the following:

- 1. ... the applicant is requested to provide comprehensive details in relation to the location of the existing farm complex/buildings associated with the proposed development and to provide a comprehensive justification for the*

*proposed development in the form of documentary evidence of an existing functioning farm enterprise.*

2. *(i) .. submit a detailed set of drawings presenting the vertical and horizontal sight distances... in accordance with DM standard 28 of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the relevant Transport Infrastructure Ireland design standards...*  
*(ii) ... detailed clarification in the format of a road profile presented in cross section details incorporating of new set back of boundary treatment... to ensure the perpetuity of obtaining clear and unobstructed sightlines.*  
*(iii) ...surface run-off water ... shall not be discharged onto the road or the adjoining property and shall only be disposed of within the site... please provide a site-specific section drawing of proposed drainage infrastructure...*
3. *(i) ...the applicant is requested to submit a Nutrient Management Plan accompanied by relevant agency (Teagasc or equivalent) approved maps of the land banks which will be used for spreading slurry and other agricultural effluents generated from this farm...*  
*(ii) Submit details of number and type of all animals on this farm.*  
*(iii) Submit evidence that there is adequate storage available for all agricultural effluent produced on this farm...*

The **second report** dated 29 April 2026 is the basis for the decision to refuse. The report notes that supplementary documentation and supportive evidence submitted as part of Further Information response, did not satisfactorily address the further information request. The sightline drawings submitted by the applicant was considered acceptable. The lack of details submitted regarding the road construction/composition and requested detail on drainage aspects of the design allows for outstanding concern regarding impact of the proposed development on the adjacent streams and land drains. The proposed development is located at a substantial distance from the farm complex, and the applicant has not confirmed the principle for the proposed works at this location.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

TII – The response dated 10 February 2026 requests that the Planning Authority has regard to the provision and policies for proposals impacting national roads.

IFI – no response.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file

## 4.0 Planning History

None relevant.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1 Galway County Development Plan 2022-29

The site is located within un-zoned open countryside lands that are governed by rural policies and guidelines. As per Section 2.4.12 of the Development Plan, Rural Typologies, in County Galway the following rural designations apply: 'Areas under Strong Urban Influence' and 'Structurally Weak Areas'. The subject site is designated as a "Structurally Weak Rural Areas" in the Development Plan. These include areas with a decline in population and weaker economic structure based on indices of income, employment and economic growth.

Chapter 4 Rural Living and Development

- Section 4.7 Rural Development
- Section 4.8 Agriculture

Chapter 7 Infrastructure, Utilities & Environmental Protection

- Policy 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.

Chapter 8 Tourism and Landscape

- Policy LCM 3 – Landscape Sensitivity Rating – The subject site is located within Class 1 Low Landscape Sensitivity Area.

#### Chapter 10 Natural Heritage, Biodiversity and Green/Blue Infrastructure

- Section 10.14 Inland Lakes/Waterways: A 'Riparian Zone' is an integral part of the protection of a watercourse system and should be sufficiently wide to protect the river or water course. The determined width should be tailored to site specific, river reach or lakeshore characteristics. It is important that the buffer zone is large enough to protect the ecological integrity of the river (including emergent vegetation) and the riparian zone (bank side vegetation including trees) takes into account the human history of the area. It is the Council's policy objective to protect this zone from inappropriate development.
- Policy IW 1 Inland Waterways - (c) Protect the riparian zones of watercourse systems throughout the County, recognising the benefits they provide in relation to flood risk management and their protection of the ecological integrity of watercourse systems and ensure they are considered in the land use zoning in Local Area Plans.
- Policy WR 1 - Water Resources - Protect the water resources in the plan area... in accordance with the requirements and guidance in the EU Water Framework Directive 2000 (2000/60/EC), the European Union (Water Policy) Regulations 2003 (as amended), the River Basin District Management Plan 2018 – 2021 and other relevant EU Directives... and also have regard to the Freshwater Pearl Mussel Sub-Basin Management Plans.
- Policy TWHS 1 Trees, Hedgerows, Natural Boundaries and Stone Walls - Protect and seek to retain important trees, tree clusters and tree boundaries, ancient woodland, natural boundaries including stonewalls, existing hedgerows particularly species rich roadside and townland boundary hedgerows, where possible and replace with a boundary type similar to the existing boundary.

#### Chapter 14 Climate Change

- Policy FL 7 Protection of Waterbodies and Watercourses Protect waterbodies and watercourses within the County from inappropriate development,

including rivers, streams, associated undeveloped riparian strips, wetlands and natural floodplains. This will include protection buffers in riverine, wetland and coastal areas as appropriate.

#### Chapter 15 Development Management Standards

- DM Standard 28 – Sight distances required for National/ Regional/ Local and Private Road – On narrow Local Roads with poor horizontal and vertical alignment and where the 80km/h speed limit applies, the design speed applied for access visibility requirements should be the speed km/h that one can drive the road in a safe manner. This can be assessed as the 85th percentile speed drivers travel on the road. The visibility will then be assessed on the 85th percentile speed for that road.
- DM Standard 33 - Traffic Impact Assessment, Traffic & Transport Assessment, Road Safety Audit & Noise Assessment - Require all planning applications for significant development proposals to be accompanied by a TTA, RSA and RSIA to be carried out by a suitably competent consultant, which are assessed in association with their cumulative impact with neighbouring developments on the road network.
- DM Standard 46 - Compliance with Landscape Sensitivity Designations – Class 1 Low sensitivity lands – All development of appropriate scale and design and are consistent with settlement policies.
- DM Standard 47 - Field Patterns, Stone Walls, Trees and Hedgerows - In general, only the minimum interference with existing field patterns, stone walls, trees and hedges shall be permitted.
- DM Standard 50 - Environmental Assessments
- DM Standard 51 – Green Infrastructure - The Planning Authority will encourage the protection of all mature trees and hedgerows, which occur on development sites and roads.
- DM Standard 67 - Sustainable Drainage Systems' (SuDS) - All new developments will be required to incorporate SuDS as part of the development design/proposals. The systems should aim to mimic the natural

drainage of the application site to minimise the effect of a development on flooding and pollution of existing waterways.

#### **5.4 Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is located c.3km from Crit Island West NHA (Site Code 000254), c.5km from Killure Bog NHA (site code 001283) and c.8.8km from River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097). The site is also located c.3.6km off proposed NHA Ballinasloe Esker.

#### **6.0 EIA Screening**

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report. Although the development is described as a road in the statutory notices. The works are in relation to an unmetalled track for agricultural purposes. Having regard to the materials proposed, the works would not constitute a road for the purpose of EIA.

#### **7.0 The Appeal**

##### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

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

- Works for a farm road can be deemed temporary as it can be removed and land restored to original state. Works would not produce any visual intrusion to the landscape.
- Farm road will eliminate any severe damage to soil structure – which is central to the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). The road would eliminate the need for heavy machinery from traversing the fields when harvesting silage crops or when land spreading animal manures is collected.

- The Further Information request issued by the Planning Authority sought justification for the proposals, management of surface water, a nutrient management plan, and sightlines. No request was made regarding the details for the river crossing or construction management
- The refusal reason states that the site is located in a sensitive location and refers to an open stream on site. The applicant has stated that there is no stream in the vicinity for the first 230m. At which point the proposed road would cross the stream and continue along the double fenced earth bank for another 250m.
- The applicant has stated that there is another stream on the neighbouring land and that run-off from the subject site cannot enter this stream.
- The applicant contends that the site levels are for the most part flat.
- It is stated that works would be carried out in good weather conditions and would be stopped if weather deteriorates. The applicant contends that there is no risk to the adjoining stream from the proposed construction. Works are estimated to be completed in 3 days maximum.
- The appeal includes pictures of similar scale bridge construction. Details of the construction is stated as 2no. piers either side of the river using steel or in precast concrete or a combination of that will span across the river.
- The construction of road will reduce compaction and damage to fields when farming in less-than-ideal weather conditions.
- The proposed road is not through an SAC/SPA. The level of details requested is disproportionate to the scale of development proposed.

## 7.2. Planning Authority Response

None on file

## 7.3. Observations

None on file.

## 8.0 Assessment

8.1. I consider the main issues in determining this appeal as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Need for the development
- Traffic Safety
- Lack of details

8.2. Principle of development: The Planning Authority's refusal reason cited lack of clarity on the principle of proposed development. The subject site is located in the rural hinterland of Ballinasloe Co. Galway. The site is located outside any lands zoned for any purposes. This appeal application seeks permission for a farm road within lands currently in agricultural use. The principle of development is therefore acceptable at this location, subject to detailed considerations below.

**Commented [MM3]:** This is unduly complicated. The proposed development is to assist in farming activities, on a farm in an area where the main land use is agriculture. It is acceptable in principle.

8.3. Need for the development: The applicant has stated that the proposed road section is required for carrying out farming activities in the site and that the path is for the use of heavy machinery used in farming. A Nutrient Management Plan (NMP), Basic Income Support Scheme (BISS) application and a fertilizer plan was submitted at Further Information stage to show the extent of farming activities carried out by the applicant. The Planning Authority in their assessment considered the submitted documentation to be insufficient to provide satisfactory justification for the proposed scale of works. As per the appeal statement made by the applicant, the proposed road would eliminate the need for heavy machinery from traversing the fields when harvesting silage crops or when land spreading.

8.4. It is noted that the full extent of the applicant's land ownership/control is not shown in the submitted Site Location map. A Teagasc mapping provided at Further Information stage shows the plots of land that are currently farmed by the applicant. The NMP and the BISS application details show that the applicant is mainly engaged in cattle rearing. The applicant's justification for the proposed farm road, on the basis that it is to be used by heavy machinery for farming is, in this instance, given the limited scale of proposed road, is considered acceptable.

**Commented [MM4]:** He explains it very clearly - the lands are wet, the heavy machinery is destroying the soil structure in the fields and the farm road prevents this from happening.

- 8.5. Traffic Safety: Access for the proposed road is via an existing farm entrance, and cattle pen off Local Road L3413. L3413 is indicated to have a speed limit of 60km/hr which corresponds to a sight distance of 90m as per DM Standard 28 of the Development Plan. On site visit, I noted that the existing sightlines are encroached by the existing hedgerows and vegetation to the sides of the entrance.
- 8.6. At Further Information stage the applicant had provided a drawing (Dwg. Title: Entrance Layout) demonstrating the availability of 70m sightlines from a c.2.4m setback of the road edge. The Planning Authority in their assessment considered the response to be acceptable. However, I note that the reduced sight lines here have not been justified by a traffic survey establishing the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed along this section of the road. If permission is considered for the proposed works, the required sight lines should be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority by way of condition.
- 8.7. From the supplementary documents submitted at Further Information, it is understood that the applicant has control of lands surrounding the site. If permission is considered for the proposed development, it is recommended that a suitably worded condition be included in the permission to ensure that the applicant carry out the necessary works to clear vegetation and improve the available sight lines at the existing entrance for the proposed farm road.
- 8.8. Lack of detail: The Planning Authority has raised serious concerns regarding the lack of detail in the submitted documents regarding the proposed river crossing and road construction aspects. The applicant in the appeal has stated that the construction of proposed farm road would only involve simple steps and machinery. The process is stated to include the removal of topsoil using a digger down to a solid base, followed by filling with gravel (50mm fine) using a tractor dumper and levelled using a digger. The applicant has stated that the works would follow Department of Agriculture specifications. No further details have been provided with regard to the finishes, or quantum of soil that is to be removed and how the removed soil is to be disposed.
- 8.9. The subject site has a surface water body, Kilconnell Stream (EPA code 26K20) traversing the site in an east-west direction. The proposed farm road would require crossing this waterbody at one point. It is acknowledged that this crossing cannot be avoided. The construction of a bridge was not included in the development

description, nor has any design details or specifications for the proposed river crossings been submitted, at application or appeal stage. On site visit I also noted the presence of mature riparian trees such as alder, birch etc along the section of watercourse proposed for the river crossing. The applicant has not submitted any details regarding the trees proposed to be removed and contour of the site. These trees also help in stabilising the banks and would require careful removal so that silt/sediments do not enter the drain channel. Persons proposing to carry out construction/alteration works on bridges and culverts are required to get special consent/licence from OPW and engage with IFI. However, no evidence of such engagement has been submitted with the appeal/application.

- 8.10. The Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine Specification S199 (Minimum Specification for Farm Roadways and Underpasses), sets out the measures to prevent direct runoff of soiled water and sediment from farm roadways to watercourses. It is apparent that due consideration has not been given to its requirements. On site visit, I also noted the undulating site levels which is the lowest at the open drain/stream channel. The proposed farm road might require additional surface water drainage measures to prevent, runoff from the road entering the waterbody.
- 8.11. At the appeal stage the applicant has provided a reference image for a proposed river crossing, indicating a steel frame bailey bridge (truss bridge) to be constructed over 2no. piers either side of the river using steel or precast concrete. It is noted that the applicant intends to carry out works within the lower banks of the existing watercourse. However, no construction management measures are outlined in the documentation to protect the watercourse from possible pollution events associated with the construction except that the works would be carried out in good weather conditions. In the absence of details and a full construction management plan, it is not possible to assess the full impacts of the proposed development. In this instance, due to the restricted application site boundary and lack of detail there is limited scope to address the deficiencies in the proposals by way of compliance conditions. It is recommended that permission be refused.
- 8.12. Conclusion: Having considered the aspects of the proposed development, submitted documentation and having visited the site, it can be concluded that the applicant has not provided sufficient level of details or construction management measures to

Commented [MM5]: This can be conditioned to be agreed with the planning authority

safeguard the surrounding environment. There are serious outstanding issues, with regard to the proposed river crossing, construction management and site levels, which needs to be addressed before permission is consented. Although some of the details can be clarified by way of condition with the Planning Authority, having considered the risk of deterioration in the ecological and/or chemical status of the existing waterbody traversing the site, it is considered necessary to refuse permission for the proposed development.

## 9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The subject site is not located within a designated site. The site is located c.3km from Crit Island West NHA (Site Code 000254), c.5km from Killure Bog NHA (site code 001283) and c.8.8km from River Suck Callows SPA (site code 004097). The site is also located c.3.6km off proposed NHA Ballinasloe Esker.
- 9.3. The development seeking permission is a road section finished in fine gravel material with two minor river crossing sections. An AA Screening report has not been submitted with the application.
- 9.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project and distance with any European Site, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any significant effects on a European Site.
- 9.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The scale, size and limited nature of the proposed works
  - Distance from European sites identified
  - Weak connection with the SAC.
- 9.6. I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken in accordance with Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), as transposed by the European Communities (Water Policy) Regulations 2003, as amended, and with regard to the Eastern/Southeastern River Basin Management Plan 2022–2027.
- 10.2. The receiving water environment has been identified and assessed, see Appendix 2 Table 2 attached. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and in the absence of adequate mitigation measures, the applicant has not demonstrated satisfactorily that the proposed development will not:
- Result in deterioration of the ecological, chemical, or quantitative status of any relevant surface water or groundwater body;
  - Increase pollutant loading or alter the hydrological regime of any receiving watercourse;
  - Impede achievement of environmental objectives under the applicable River Basin Management Plan.
- 10.3. Accordingly, it remains uncertain as to whether the proposed development is compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

## 11.0 Recommendation

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

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, and in particular the proximity to the DERRYMULLAN\_010 (River) which is designated as a good status waterbody under the Water Framework Directive, the Commission is not satisfied that, in the absence of a sufficient buffer, the

proposed development would not give rise to a risk of deterioration in the ecological and/or chemical status of the said water body. Permitting the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), as transposed into Irish law by the European Communities (Water Policy) Regulations 2003 (S.I. No. 722 of 2003), as amended, and would be inconsistent with the objectives of the Water Action Plan 2024, contravene Policy Objective WR1 objective of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-28.

2. Having regard to the information provided with the application in relation to the proposed crossing/ culverting of drainage stream, the assessment has not included aquatic and riparian ecological surveys, hydro morphological assessment, biosecurity measures and site-specific mitigation measures, method statements and engineering design to ensure that the ecological functioning of the watercourse is maintained. In the absence of this information, the potential for downstream impacts, particularly in relation to hydrology, water quality and aquatic species, impacts on the watercourse and the species reliant on same cannot be effectively assessed. Furthermore, permitting the development in the current location would conflict with Councils policies, as expressed in the specific Policy IW 1 (Inland Waterways) and Policy FL 7 (Protection of Waterbodies/Watercourses) of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-28 Development Plan. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

---

Sandra Eapen  
Planning Inspector

07 September 2026

## Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Case Reference</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | PL-501427-GY-26                                                                                                        |
| <b>Proposed Development Summary</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Construction of a farm road c.482m long (4.25 m wide) crossing the landbanks in a north-south and east-west direction. |
| <b>Development Address</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Highfield , Kilconnell , Ballinasloe Co. Galway                                                                        |
| <b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                        |
| <b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>                                                                                                                                                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.                                            |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.                                                               |
| (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:<br>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,<br>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) |                                                                                                                        |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>                                                                                                                   | <b>State the Class here</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>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?</b> |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.<br><b>No Screening required.</b>                                  | Although the development is described as a road in the statutory notices. The works are in relation to an unmetalled track for agricultural purposes. Having regard to the materials proposed, the works would not constitute a road for the purpose of EIA. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>                                                                                                                       | <b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

|                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)<br/>OR<br/>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>                              |                                                                           |
| <p>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)?</p> |                                                                           |
| <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>                                                                                                                             | <p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>                 |
| <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>                                                                                                                   | <p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p> |

Inspector: Sandra Eapen Date: 07 September 2026

## Appendix 2: WFD Impact Assessment Scoping

Table 1

| WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE                  |                 |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality |                 |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                     |
| An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.                       | PL-501427-GY-26 | Townland, address                                                                                                                                                                       | Kilconnell , Ballinasloe Co. Galway |
| Description of project                               |                 | Permission is being sought for the construction of c.482m of farm road (4.25m wide) and 50mm gravel finishes.                                                                           |                                     |
| Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening    |                 | Site is located within an existing rural hinterland of Ballinasloe. The site is undulating and includes 1 no. surface water stream crossing the site.<br>Derrymullan Stream_010 (River) |                                     |
| Proposed surface water details                       |                 | Surface water is proposed to discharge to ground.                                                                                                                                       |                                     |
| Proposed water supply source & available capacity    |                 | Not applicable                                                                                                                                                                          |                                     |

|                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b></p> | <p>The applicant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the subject works would include any design or standard practice measures proposed that would reduce the risk of impacts to surface water.</p> |
| <p><b>Others?</b></p>                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

**Table 2**

| Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection |                           |                  |                                                                      |                                         |                                                                                |                              |                                                                                                                                                                               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Identified water body                                                        | Water body name(s) (code) | WFD Status       | Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk | Identified pressures on that water body | Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater) | Mitigation Measures proposed | Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?                                                                                                                 |
| Aughrim<br>(Groundwater body)                                                | IE_SH_G_019               | Good (2019-2024) | Not at risk                                                          | N/A                                     | Direct hydrological, surface run-off.                                          | Not clear                    | Uncertain                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DERRYMULLAN STREAM_010<br>(River)                                            | IE_SH_26D070400           | Good (2019-2024) | Not at risk                                                          | N/A                                     | Direct hydrological, surface run-off.                                          | Not clear                    | Likely impacts cannot be eliminated. Applicant has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that satisfactory mitigation measures will be undertaken to prevent pollution events. |