



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501462-RN-26

Development	Construct 1 no. dwelling, alterations to yard and existing dwelling on site, demolition of shed and all associated works.
Location	The Old Stables, Árd Comáin, Henry Street, Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660117
Applicant(s)	Denise and Michael Cuttle
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Denise and Michael Cuttle
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	18 th August 2026
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 EIA Screening.....	9
7.0 The Appeal	9
8.0 Assessment	12
9.0 AA Screening.....	16
10.0 Water Framework Directive	17
11.0 Recommendation	17
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	18
13.0 Conditions	18
Appendix 1: EIA Pre-Screening.....	22

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.027ha site is situated in Roscommon town centre in a cul-de-sac called Árd Comáin east of Henry Street and 35m south of St. Coman's church and graveyard. The cul-de-sac serves a small housing estate and one commercial property.
- 1.2. The site comprises the private open space area and driveway of an end of terrace two storey dwelling. The existing dwelling is situated at the east and the aforementioned commercial property at the west. That commercial property comprises a small warehouse/storage facility. The land to the south at the rear comprises a large rear open space associated with a dwelling to the southwest.
- 1.3. There is a domestic shed situated at the rear of the site at the south. Access is provided from the cul-de-sac at the north.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
 - To construct a 2-storey, 2-bedroom dwelling house neighbouring existing dwelling no. 9 off henry street with alterations to rear yard,
 - For demolition of existing shed,
 - Alterations to rear elevation of the existing dwelling no. 9,
 - Alteration of existing front boundary to include an additional vehicular site entrance to serve the existing dwelling no.9 and
 - All ancillary site development works

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. A notification to refuse permission was issued by Roscommon County Council on 12th May 2026 for 2no. reasons as follows:
 1. The proposed development would give rise to overdevelopment of a restricted site and if permitted would set an undesirable precedent for other similarly

inappropriate ad hoc development. The proposed development would be injurious to existing residential amenities and would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The proposed development does not provide car parking on site to serve either the existing dwelling or the proposed dwelling and in addition would give rise to the displacement of the existing on-site car parking provision serving the existing dwelling. Such undue car parking displacement in an area which already experiences congestion has the potential to give rise to increased congestion and conflicting vehicular movements, would endanger public safety by reason of a traffic hazard or obstruction of road users and would accordingly be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Planners report recommendation to refuse permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) issues were screened out.
- It considered the principle of development was acceptable in the context of local, regional and national policy but at a site-specific level such infill and compact settlement development types should not be at the cost of providing high quality and safe living accommodation or contributing positively to the urban environment.
- It suggested the design approach reflects the character of the area however the layout and massing have potential to create overshadowing to the adjacent dwelling while the rear garden would also be substandard. Further concerns were set out regarding the loss of off street car parking for the existing dwelling as well as generating increased demand for on-street parking through the creation of another dwelling.

- The report acknowledges that section 12.24 of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 allows for a reduction in car parking standards but regard was had to an existing level of on-street parking and congestion in the area and therefore further parking displacement would exacerbate this issue and result in conflicting vehicular movements and endanger public safety.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Regeneration Unit: No response received.
- Roscommon Municipal District Office: No response received.
- Roads Department: Report received which noted an existing deficit in car parking availability and setting out concerns that the development could impact vulnerable road users in the area by not providing the necessary car parking requirements. Note this is based on the commentary in the Case Planner's report as no Roads Department report was present on the file.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- The Heritage Council: No response.
- Transport Infrastructure Ireland: Recommendation to insert condition requiring adherence to relevant codes of engineering and guidelines for proposals impacting national roads and the Luas rail network.
- An Taisce: No response.
- Uisce Éireann: No response.
- Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage: Recommendation to insert condition requiring archaeological monitoring during groundworks.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- None

4.0 Planning History

- 06/1614: Planning permission granted to subdivide residential site and construct a 2-storey, 3-bed dwelling to the side of no. 9 Henry Street with alterations to the rear yard including demolition of existing shed and associated site works.
- 06/271: Planning permission refused to subdivide residential site and construct a 2-storey, 3-bed dwelling to the side of no. 9 Henry Street with alterations to the rear yard including demolition of existing shed and associated site works. Permission was refused for one reason as follows:
 1. It is considered that the proposed development would constitute over development of a restricted site, would be substandard in terms of amenity and private open space and would seriously diminish the amenity of adjacent property and would thus be contrary to the proper planning and sustainability development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP). Strategic aim no. 6, as set out in table 1.1 of the CDP is stated as follows:

'Promote the regeneration and renewal of towns and villages throughout County Roscommon, and create healthy place-making by improving the attractiveness, quality, design, viability and vibrancy of towns and villages. This will be achieved in part through a focus on the redevelopment / development of /infill / brownfield lands within the existing built settlement footprints, in accordance with the principle of compact growth as set out in the NPF.'

- 5.1.2. Policy objectives CS 2.5, TV 4.2, TV 4.9, TV 4.18 and TV 4.20 all support and encourage compact settlements, infill developments in town centres and increased density. Policy Objective 3.4 meanwhile seeks to *'Encourage innovation in design and require development proposals to be of high quality and make a positive contribution to the built environment and local streetscape'*.

- 5.1.3. Chapter 12 of the CDP sets out development management standards and I note Table 12.1 sets out car parking standards and requires a minimum of 1.5 spaces for 1-3 bed units. Under the heading of 'Car Parking Standards' however in section 12.24, I note the CDP states *'a reduction in the standard of car parking provision in town centre areas will also be considered'*.
- 5.1.4. The CDP does not specify minimum residential standards in terms of private open space or densities etc. Section 12.6 of the development management standards chapter states 'All new urban development proposals will be assessed in accordance with national guidelines and any superseding guidelines for same' and in this regard I consider the development should be assessed against the standards set out in the Compact Settlement Guidelines as described later below.

5.2. Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030

- 5.2.1. The Roscommon Town Local Area Plan (LAP) does not specifically set out land use zoning objectives. The site is zoned 'Town Core' and section 11.3 of the LAP states the zoning strategy for this land use *'is to deliver on the overarching vision to provide a high quality, accessible and consolidated built environment, which incentives opportunities for new economies to grow and provides a quality destination for people to live'*. Figure 11.1 sets out the zoning matrix and classifies a single dwelling in the town core as a use which is open for consideration. Such uses may be permitted in circumstances where it is compatible *'with the policies and objectives for the zone, will not conflict with the permitted, existing or adjoining land uses and conforms with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.'*
- 5.2.2. Section 2.4 states *'there will be an emphasis on utilising infill, backland and brownfield site opportunities to deliver new housing. This approach aims to enhance the vitality of the town centre and deliver a more compact, accessible and consolidated urban environment.'*
- 5.2.3. The following policy objectives are noted:
- RN 3 seeks to *'Ensure the delivery of compact residential growth that aligns with the growth ambitions and density ranges for Roscommon Town, in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).'*

- RN 4 seeks to *‘Ensure all new residential development proposals demonstrate an efficient use of serviced lands in order to maximise the sustainable use of infrastructure services and facilities in the area, in accordance with proper planning and sustainable development.’*
- RN 7 seeks to *‘Facilitate additional residential development in established residential areas, in keeping with the existing residential character of the area and adequately protecting the amenity of existing residential properties in the area.’*
- RN 12 seeks to *‘Develop sustainable and successful neighbourhoods through the consolidation and redevelopment of built-up areas within the town centre. Promote new compact mixed use forms of development, served by public transport and green infrastructure.’*

5.3. National Guidance

5.3.1. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines.

The guidelines, hereafter referred to as the Compact Settlement Guidelines, seek to create higher density settlements to underpin sustainable development principles. Specific Planning Policy Requirements (SPPRs) are set out including SPPR 1 which refers to minimum standards for separation distances between opposing windows in habitable rooms above ground floor to the rear and side of dwellings. SPPR 2 sets out minimum private open space standards for houses and requires 30m² to be provided for 2-bed dwellings. It also provides for flexibility for small urban infill schemes on sites up to 0.25ha and states *‘the private open space standard may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and proximity to public open space.’*

5.3.2. Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, DoEHLG 2007

The guidelines are a best practice handbook for identifying good quality residential amenity in order to deliver homes and sustainable communities. The guidelines were not published under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, but are intended to provide guidance and recommendations to achieve a minimum standard of residential amenity. They do not purport to be comprehensive

nor seek to prescribe design solutions. They are intended to assist designers but proper design input on each project remains essential.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.4.1. The site is situated 3.8km northwest of Lough Ree Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) and also 4.6km northeast of Ballinturly Turlough SAC and pNHA.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The proposed development is precisely the type of small-scale urban infill development supported by national, regional and local policy. It would provide an additional compact two-bedroom own-door dwelling in the established built-up footprint of Roscommon Town, close to services, amenities and infrastructure. It would replace an existing shed structure with a permanent residential use, thereby making more efficient use of serviced Town Core lands.
- The Council's own report states residential use is permitted in principle on the site, infill development in the area could deliver sustainable compact growth, appropriately designed development on limited site areas can contribute to town-centre vitality, and such development can make more efficient use of infrastructure and services. The principle of development is clearly acceptable and strongly supported by the adopted planning framework.

- Roscommon County Council has previously accepted the capacity of this general site context to accommodate a two-storey dwelling adjoining No. 9. The current proposal is for a more modest two-bedroom dwelling rather than the previously permitted three-bedroom dwelling.
- The development is not an isolated, speculative or unplanned backland form and therefore is not ad-hoc. The case planners report notes the design is reflective of the town house typology and is in character with the area, confirming that the development is not visually discordant. The development would complete and consolidate the existing built form rather than introduce an alien or inappropriate suburban layout.
- Compact Settlement Guidelines require a flexible approach to small urban infill sites in terms of separation distances, private open space, car parking and cycle parking to enable compact housing. They also introduce reduced plot sizes, tighter house arrangements, narrower streets, reduced car parking ratios and private open space in the form of patio gardens and/or terraces as part of compact housing models. It would therefore be inappropriate to assess this Town Core infill proposal as though it were a conventional suburban greenfield dwelling and the appeal suggests that the development is assessed in that flexible urban infill context.
- The case planner's report expressly states that the matters of private open space and overshadowing could be addressed through redesign if the proposal were otherwise acceptable, and that these issues did not warrant inclusion in the refusal reasons. This is important as the formal refusal reason is a broad allegation of overdevelopment, not a specific refusal based on failure of private open space standards or demonstrated daylight/sunlight harm. Further, the guidelines state separation distances should be informed by layout, design and site characteristics and therefore any residual concern regarding overlooking, overshadowing or private amenity space could be addressed by condition.
- No third party submissions were made alleging injury to residential amenity. In the absence of specific evidence, the appeal submits that a generalised allegation of injury to residential amenity or depreciation of property value is insufficient to justify refusal of a modest two-bedroom Town Core infill dwelling.

- The proposal would remove an existing shed structure of approximately 38m² and replace it with a permanent, purpose-designed dwelling that addresses the town-centre residential context. The proposal would therefore rationalise an underutilised site within the existing builtup footprint and provide an additional home on serviced land. The proposal accords with proper planning and sustainable development by contributing to compact growth, town-centre consolidation and efficient use of infrastructure.
- Regarding car parking, the appeal submits that the refusal is not justified having regard to the site's Town Core location, national compact settlement policy, the modest scale of the development, and the absence of technical evidence demonstrating that one additional two-bedroom dwelling would create a traffic hazard.
- The compact settlement guidelines state car parking standards should be reduced or wholly eliminated in certain urban locations while the Roscommon CDP also provides for flexibility and reduction in car parking standards subject to site-specific considerations. The appeal submits that a zero or reduced-car arrangement is appropriate in principle for such a location, particularly where the development is close to town-centre services and can be supported by secure cycle storage.
- Traffic generation from a 2-bed unit would be negligible. The case planner's report states the development would result in congestion and conflicting vehicular movement but does not identify any such issues such as accident history, speeding issues, a parking survey or traffic count, swept path analysis demonstrating existing concerns, a road safety audit or any technical evidence to demonstrate that the 2-bed dwelling would endanger traffic safety. The proposed development would not create a new road, junction or major access. It is a small domestic infill proposal in a town-centre setting.
- The guidelines suggest on-street parking can form part of traffic calming, support greater turnover of spaces and reduce the visual impact of parked cars relative to in-curtilage or large areas of surface parking. This is relevant because the Council's refusal appears to assume that absence of in-curtilage parking is inherently unacceptable. That assumption is not consistent with current compact growth and sustainable mobility policy. Town-centre residential development will often involve

lower or zero in-curtilage parking. That is a normal feature of compact settlement form, particularly for small infill and terrace housing.

- The existence of a private parking space does not mean that the site should be sterilised from housing development where the land is centrally located, zoned Town Core, serviced, and capable of providing a compact dwelling. The displacement of a private parking
- arrangement must be balanced against the delivery of an additional home on zoned, serviced, Town Core land. A refusal would give disproportionate weight to preservation of private car parking over the delivery of compact residential development. This would be contrary to national policy direction, which seeks reduced car dependence and more efficient use of urban land. The appeal also provided a 'walking distance assessment' demonstrating walking times from the site to key urban locations nearby including an area of open space 10 minutes walking distance from the site.
- There are no environmental, archaeological or services issues that preclude a grant of permission.
- Suggested conditions are set out which include archaeological monitoring, a mobility management plan, restricting the use of the dwelling to prevent short term letting, application of SuDS, and agreement of further privacy measures such as obscure glazing etc prior to the commencement of development.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

- 8.1.1. The site is situated on town centre zoned lands where single dwellings are open for consideration. The site is currently in residential use and the land use therefore will not change. I further note there is considerable policy support both at national and

local level for infill developments leading to compact settlements. Having regard to all these matters, I consider the principle of development is acceptable.

- 8.1.2. The layout and design of the proposed dwelling is based on the existing dwellings situated in the cul-de-sac and follows a very similar plot width and front elevation width while the front and rear building lines and the ridge heights will all match the existing dwellings. The main deviation from the established dwelling design on the existing terrace is to the rear where the existing dwellings each have a single storey return which does not span the full width of the rear elevation while the proposed dwelling would have a two storey return extending across the full width of the rear elevation. All external materials and finishes are proposed to match the existing dwellings. In this regard, I consider the design of the dwelling fits in with the character of the area and does not detract from the streetscape. Matters regarding the increased mass of the dwelling to the rear and any associated impacts will be discussed below.
- 8.1.3. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report/s of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:
- Residential Amenity
 - Car Parking

8.2. Residential Amenity

- 8.2.1. The site comprises 270m² with a proposed gross floor space of 96m² following demolition of the existing shed. 48m² of this would comprise the ground floor footprint of the new structure, resulting in a site coverage rate of 35% which is acceptable in my opinion for the town centre site and in keeping with the area.
- 8.2.2. The site will be subdivided in such a way that a pedestrian route will be maintained around the perimeter providing access to the rear open space of the existing dwelling. Subsequently, the private open space afforded to the proposed dwelling

comprises 31m² which meets the requirements for a 2-bed dwelling as per SPPR 2 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines.

- 8.2.3. The internal layout of the existing dwelling at no. 9 is not specified or illustrated however having regard to its overall scale I consider it is unlikely to have more than 3no. bedrooms. The Compact Settlement Guidelines require 40m² of private open space to be provided for 3-bed dwellings and the proposed layout suggests 38m² would be provided. Having regard to the urban town centre nature location of the site as well as the infill nature of the overall development, I consider an acceptable quantum of private open space would be provided to serve the needs of occupants in the existing dwelling. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development meets the requirements of the Compact Settlement Guidelines in terms of provision of private amenity space and would not represent overdevelopment.
- 8.2.4. With respect to overlooking, I note the land directly to the rear of the site is vacant and has no structures and specifically no directly opposing windows above ground floor situated within 16m of the proposed rear elevation. I am therefore satisfied that overlooking would not occur. I note the Case Planner's report refers to a recommendation in the Compact Settlement Guidelines to provide 8m long rear gardens in order to maintain a 16m separation distance between opposing elevations however I do not agree with this interpretation. I note the guidelines do require a 16m separation but also note that deviations may be acceptable subject to detailed design which eliminates overlooking. Further, the Case Planner's report states the rear garden depth is 7.1m however this does not take account of the proposed new pedestrian route. The distance between the proposed rear elevation where windows would be situated, and the existing property boundary where potential future development may be situated, is stated on the site layout drawing to comprise 7.3m and I consider this is sufficient to ensure the adjoining land to the south is not sterilised from future development due to the proposed window placement. I am therefore satisfied that any new overlooking afforded from the proposed development will not negatively impact existing residential development to such a degree as to warrant a refusal of permission.
- 8.2.5. The Case Planner's report suggests the proposed two storey return has the potential to overshadow a rear window of the adjacent property to the east. Having regard to the southern aspect of the existing rear elevations I consider some overshadowing

would occur in the evenings when the sun is at the west, however, I consider the scale of any such overshadowing would be negligible in the first instance due to the southern aspect of the site. I also consider a degree of overshadowing is inevitable in an urban environment and do not consider the impact of the proposed development would be likely to negatively impact the internal amenity of any of the adjacent rooms with south facing windows.

- 8.2.6. In conclusion, I consider the layout and design of the proposed dwelling is acceptable and represents an appropriate scale of infill development in an urban, zoned and serviced location. The assessment above demonstrates that existing and proposed residential amenity would not be negatively impacted and therefore I do not agree that the development would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity.

8.3. Car Parking

- 8.3.1. The layout of the proposed development would simultaneously remove two car parking spaces as well as introduce a further demand for spaces by provision of a dwelling. If the development were permitted, neither dwelling would have a parking space and car parking would be limited to an informal on-street arrangement.
- 8.3.2. Following a site inspection of the cul-de-sac which has 9no. dwellings, I note that some of the existing dwellings utilise on-street parking as the middle terrace units have no spaces within their own curtilage. I noted there are no double yellow lines in the cul-de-sac prohibiting on-street parking but there is also an issue of vehicles parking on some footpaths in order to maintain the road width and vehicular access.
- 8.3.3. The site is situated in the town centre and the applicant provided details of the walking time to some standard community and retail services, all of which are under 10min walking distance.
- 8.3.4. I also note the CDP requires 1.5 spaces for 1-3 bed units, and therefore 3no. parking spaces are required cumulatively however the CDP also allows for a reduction in town centre areas. I note the Compact Settlement Guidelines categorise Roscommon town in the 'key town and large town' category, however, in terms of accessibility the site is categorised as a peripheral location due to the low level and frequency of urban public transport connections. SPPR 3 of the guidelines requires maximum parking rates of 2no. spaces per dwelling to be provided in peripheral

locations. Section 5.3.4 of the guidelines states '*Car parking ratios should be reduced at all urban locations, and should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated at locations that have good access to urban services and to public transport.*'

- 8.3.5. In this context and balancing the urban location of the site which has good pedestrian connectivity to a wide range of services, with the overall low level of connectivity provided across the region by public transport, I consider the absence of in-curtilage car parking for both the existing and proposed development is acceptable having regard to the town centre location of the site, the nature and layout of the cul-de-sac which affords a limited degree of on-street parking without impacting footpaths, and also having regard to the availability of public parking and other on-street parking in close proximity to the site.
- 8.3.6. I therefore do not agree that car parking displacement would give rise to congestion and conflicting vehicular movements or endanger public safety.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered case 501462-RN-26 in light of the requirements of S177U the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 9.2. The proposed development is located within a mixed use town centre area and comprises the construction of a 2-bed unit, demolition of an existing domestic shed and all associated works. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is the Lough Ree Special Area of Conservation (SAC), located 3.8kms southeast of the proposed development.
- 9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Small scale and domestic nature of the development
 - The location of the development in a serviced urban area, distance from European Sites and urban nature of intervening habitats, absence of ecological pathways to any European Site.

- 9.5. 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.
- 9.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (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 carried out in accordance with Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive and relevant EPA guidance, including best practice in sustainable drainage design.
- 10.2. The development proposes agreement of appropriate surface water management measures prior to the commencement of development, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), designed to replicate greenfield runoff rates and provide treatment of surface water prior to discharge.
- 10.3. These measures ensure that there will be no increase in pollutant loading, no alteration of the receiving waterbody's hydrological regime, and no risk of deterioration in water quality or ecological status. Any residual risks identified during the assessment are capable of being addressed through standard mitigation measures and best practice construction management, including the implementation of an appropriate Construction Environmental Management Plan.
- 10.4. The proposed development will not impact on the achievement of environmental objectives for any water body and is therefore considered compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

- 11.1. I recommend that planning permission is granted in accordance with the conditions set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the existing residential site within the existing built up area of Roscommon town on zoned and serviced lands, the provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the Roscommon Town Local Area Plan 2024-2030 including policy objectives RN 3, RN 4, RN 7 and RN 12, the established pattern of residential development in the area and the nature and scale of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would be appropriate in terms of design and layout, would not result in the creation of a traffic hazard, and would not seriously injure the amenities of neighbouring properties in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars. Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	The external finishes of the proposed dwelling (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.
3.	The developer shall engage a suitably qualified (licensed eligible) archaeologist to monitor (licensed under the National Monuments Acts)

	all site clearance works, topsoil stripping, groundworks, dredging and/or the implementation of agreed preservation in-situ measures associated with the development following consultation with the National Monument Service (NMS). Prior to the commencement of such works the archaeologist shall consult with and forward to the Local Authority archaeologist or the NMS as appropriate a method statement for written agreement. The use of appropriate tools and/or machinery to ensure the preservation and recording of any surviving archaeological remains shall be necessary. Should archaeological remains be identified during the course of archaeological monitoring, all works shall cease in the area of archaeological interest pending a decision of the planning authority, in consultation with the National Monuments Service, regarding appropriate mitigation [preservation in-situ/excavation]. The developer shall facilitate the archaeologist in recording any remains identified. Any further archaeological mitigation requirements specified by the planning authority, following consultation with the National Monuments Service, shall be complied with by the developer. Following the completion of all archaeological work on site and any necessary post-excavation specialist analysis, the planning authority and the National Monuments Service shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of the monitoring and any subsequent required archaeological investigative work/excavation required. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer. Reason: To ensure the continued preservation [either in situ or by record] of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.
4.	Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services. Reason: In the interest of public health.

5.	Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network. Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.
6.	Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste. Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.
7.	The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme. Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with

	the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.
--	--

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

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

02nd September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PI-501462-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Construct 1 no. dwelling, alterations to yard and existing dwelling on site, demolition of shed and all associated works.
Development Address	The Old Stables, Árd Comáin, Henry Street, Roscommon.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	

☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units. Threshold = 500 units. Proposal = 1 unit. Class 10 (b)(iv) Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 hectares in the case of a business district, 10 hectares in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 hectares elsewhere. Threshold = 10ha Proposal = 0.027ha
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)

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

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 development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, requires minimal demolition, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
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 development is situated in an urban area on accessible zoned and serviced land. It is in close proximity to existing residential properties which is not exceptional in the context of surrounding development. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. It is situated 35m from the curtilage of a church and graveyard which has a high number of archaeological records and is also situated within the overall

	Roscommon town zone of notification. The site comprises a residential property which has previously experienced ground disturbance and therefore the likelihood of any significant archaeological impacts is considered low. The application of a condition requiring archaeological monitoring during groundworks, as recommended by the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage is considered appropriate mitigation.	
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).	Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.	
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:** _____