



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

PL-501486-GC-26

Development

Alterations and additions to existing dwelling including the demolition of the existing garden store, a new two-storey side/rear extension and associated development and site works.

Location

14 Enda's Road, Shantalla, Galway.

Planning Authority

Galway City Council.

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2529.

Applicant(s)

Colm Lohan & Mary O' Donnell.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

To Refuse Permission.

Type of Appeal

First Party

Appellant(s)

Colm Lohan & Mary O' Donnell.

Observer(s)

Alan o Toole & Fiona Murphy..

Date of Site Inspection

July 20th, 2026.

Inspector

Breda Gannon.

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Further information	4
4.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
5.0	Policy Context	7
6.0	EIA Screening	9
7.0	The Appeal	9
8.0	Assessment	13
9.0	Appropriate Assessment	18
10.0	Water Framework Directive	19
11.0	Recommendation	19
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	19
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening		21

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located at 14 Endas Road, Shantalla, Galway. It accommodates a two-storey end of terrace house on a site with a stated area of 383.5 m². There is a flat roof two storey extension to the rear with stepped access to a rear garden area. The garden has a T-shaped configuration and extends along the back of adjacent properties. There is a small enclosed garden to the front. To the south a boundary hedge and wall separates the site from the adjacent dwelling. The boundary with the adjacent property to the north is formed by a concrete block wall.
- 1.2. The site is part of the established residential neighbourhood of Shantalla, located to the northwest of the city centre. It consists of a number of roadways that extend from Shantalla Road in the south to Costello Road in the north. The residential roads consist primarily of terraces of single and two-houses in semi-detached and terraced arrangements with some modern interventions.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development as described in the public notices submitted with the application proposed alterations and additions to the existing dwelling, including the demolition of the existing garden store, the construction of a two-storey extension to the side and rear of the house and all ancillary site development and associated works.
- 2.2. The northern boundary of the existing rear extension would be retained. The southern and eastern walls would be removed and a new two-storey extension constructed, which would project by an additional 4.8m into the rear garden. At its closest point the new extension would be located 1.67m and 0.94m respectively from the northern and southern site boundaries.
- 2.3. The roof would be part flat with a curved profile on its northern side. It would be finished in cordion corrugated roofing in forest green. The remainder of the extension would be finished in nap plaster. The new extension would increase the floor area of the existing house (102.8 sqm) by 52.7sqm resulting in a completed floor area of 155.5sqm. An angled box window is proposed on the rear elevation of the proposed extension.
- 2.4. The existing garden shed to the rear of the house would be demolished to make way for the proposed development.

3.0 Further information

- 3.1. Further information on the application was sought by the planning authority on October 30th, 2025. It raised concerns regarding the two-storey element of the development and requested that the proposal be revised to omit the first-floor. It stated that any revisions to the first floor should not extend beyond the existing rear projection but could be wider.
- 3.2. It also requested that the location of a public sewer/drain at the rear of the site be identified and that the applicant demonstrate agreement with Uisce Eireann regarding the location of the proposed development.
- 3.3. A response to the further information request was received by the planning authority on April 13th, 2026. It concluded that the proposal was in compliance with the relevant standards of the development plan. It noted that a two-storey projection already exists to the rear of the house and that the proposal does not introduce a new two-storey element but extends the existing built form laterally. It concluded that the two-storey element was a proportionate response to the constraints of the site and was designed in response to concerns raised by the occupants of No 13. No revisions were made to the proposal
- 3.4. Engagement with Uisce Eireann (Appendix 1) confirmed that the sewer is not an Uisce Eireann asset and engagement with their diversions team is not therefore required to build over the sewer. All works to the sewer would be carried out in compliance with the relevant technical guidance and best practice.
- 3.5. It was also noted that an old lead water main is understood to be located within the rear garden. Should the water main be encountered during construction, the applicants would engage with the Diversions team and submit a proposal for review as required by Uisce Eireann.

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to refuse permission for the development for one reason as follows:

'The Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029, Section 11.3.1 (I) Residential extensions requires that *"The design and layout of extensions to houses should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities"*. In this case the first floor element of the proposed extension, due to its height, length and proximity to the side boundary and adjacent dwelling, would cast a significant shadow over the adjacent rear garden and property, while its length, height and scale, in proximity to the adjacent boundaries would be an overbearing feature and adversely impact upon the residential amenities of the adjacent property, contrary to the above stated policy and adversely impact on the residential amenities of the area.

4.2. Planning Authority Reports

4.2.1. Planning Reports

The planning officer's report of 17/10/25 noted the difference in level between the dwelling and the rear garden. The FFL of the new extension would be partially in line with that of the existing dwelling while the rear section would contain a number of steps and be level with the rear garden. A number of dwellings to the north have constructed rear extensions which are level with the FFL of their respective dwellings.

The applicant has included a number of mitigating factors to address potential overshadowing identified in the previous withdrawn application. The lower roof level, its barrel design and its position away from the northern boundary combine to reduce the impacts of any shadow cast towards the north. However, the issues identified in the previous application relating to scale, mass and length of the first-floor level have not been addressed.

A subsequent report dated 29/4/26, following the receipt of further information, noted that the applicant was afforded an opportunity to amend the design of the proposed extension, with specific concerns relating to its height and length. The applicant choose not to amend the proposal and refusal is recommended as the identified adverse impacts would remain.

No Appropriate Assessment issues arise and there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.

Other Technical Reports

None.

4.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

4.4. Third Party Observations

A submission was received from the residents of the adjacent property at 13 Enda's Road. The main issues raised relate to the following:

- Bulk, height and mass of proposed two-storey extension directly adjacent to site boundary.
- Impacts on wastewater drainage infrastructure which runs to the rear of No's 13 and 14 Enda's Road and discharges through the side path of No 14. There is no drainage plan and no evidence of consultation with Irish Water.
- Overlooking and privacy concerns: The proposed first floor triangular bay window overlooks the private amenity space of No 13.
- Daylight and overshadowing considerations: Inaccurate claims are made regarding potential impacts. As per planning application 24/60115, the planning authority previously requested site sections and ground levels be taken from neighbouring property. Access to No 13 was not requested or obtained. The ground levels and datum points shown are therefore either estimated or based on guesswork, which calls into question the accuracy of daylight, sunlight and massing assessments.
- Visual impact: The use of corrugated green metal roofing would negatively impact on neighbouring amenity. It is visually intrusive and inconsistent with the established terrace. Noise levels associated with the use of corrugated metal roofing and impacts on residential amenity.
- Previous permissions in the area: The planning authority has consistently refused large scale rear two-storey extensions on this street (24/60115, 24/60128, 07/950 & 08/320). To permit the development would set an undesirable precedent for large two-storey rear extensions.

- Significant detrimental impact on the residential amenities of existing residents.

4.5. Planning History

On site

24/60115: - This application involved the provision of a two-storey flat roofed extension projecting by 7.5m from the rear of the house on the subject site. It proposed a very marginal set back from the common boundary with No 13. The application was withdrawn following a request for further information, which included a request that the first-floor element be omitted from the proposal and that any revisions to the first floor should not extend rear projection, but could be wider.

Adjacent sites

24/60128: Permission sought for two-storey flat roofed extension and the provision of a granny flat to the rear of No 9 Endas Road. The extension was proposed along the common boundary with the adjoining property to the south (No. 10), with a projection of c 2.4m from the rear building line. This application was also withdrawn following a request for further information which also included a request that the first floor be omitted and that any revision could not extend beyond the existing rear projection.

08/320: Planning permission refused for the demolition of the existing house and the construction of a new house at No 8 St Endas Road. The planning authority expressed concerns regarding the rear projection (>10m) which would impact on the amenity of adjoining property by reason of overshadowing and overlooking.

07/950: Permission refused for the demolition of existing one and two-storey extensions at the rear of No 11 Endas Road and the construction of a new two-storey extension with attic extension. In this case the proposed extension was in line with the rear of No 12 with a marginal projection beyond the rear of No 10. The application was refused on the basis of overlooking, overdevelopment of the site and insufficient private amenity space.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The operative development plan is the **Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029**.

The site is located in an area zoned R 'Residential' with the following objective:

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

The site is located within the 'Inner Residential Areas' of the city (Fig 3.1): The following policy is relevant:

Policy 3.6: Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Inner Residential Areas

'Protect the quality of inner residential areas including Claddagh, Shantalla and Newcastle (Quincentenary Bridge) by ensuring that new development through consolidation, infill and redevelopment does not adversely affect their character and has regard to their prevailing pattern, form and density of these areas'.

Development Standards and Guidelines for Residential Development are set out in Section 11.3 of the development plan.

Section 11.3.1(I) Residential Extensions: The design and layout of the extension should complement the character and form of the existing building, having regard to its context and adjacent residential amenities.

The following is also relevant in the context of the subject appeal.

Section 11.3.1 (c) Private open space.

Section 11.3.1 (d) Overlooking.

Section 11.3.1 (e) Daylight.

Section 11.3.1 (f) Distance between Dwellings for New Residential Development.

Section 11.3.1 (g) Car Parking Standards.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

There are no Natural Heritage Areas close to the site.

The site is not located within a European site. There are 4 no. European sites within the plan area as follows:

- Lough Corrib SAC (Site code 000297) to the east and northeast.

- Lough Corrib SPA (Site code 004042) to the northeast.
- Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site code 000268) associated with Galway Bay to the south
- Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site code 004031) associated with Galway Bay to the south

6.0 EIA Screening

The development is not of a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of appeal are summarised below:

Policy Context: The sole ground of refusal invokes Section 11.3.1(l) of the Galway City Development Plan 2023-2029. This sets out a quality design objective. It does not establish a quantitative threshold and must be read in conjunction with Section 11.3.1(e), which establishes the qualitative methodology by which daylight and shadow impact on adjacent properties is to be assessed.

The daylight and sunlight assessment submitted was completed using appropriate software and in accordance updated BRE guidance explicitly referenced in Section 11.3.1(e).

Section 11.3.1.(d) requires a minimum of 11m between residential units and directly overlooked open space above ground level. The proposed extension complies with this requirement. The angled box window on the rear elevation has been carefully positioned to provide the required 11m distance from the boundary as indicated on Drawing 25002-PL-03.

Ground of Refusal: The refusal reason is a subjective assertion that is directly contradicted by the quantitative technical evidence submitted with the application. The refusal reason does not engage with the daylight and sunlight assessment, does not dispute its methodology and does not identify any specific measurement or calculation that fails to meet the standard required by the development plan.

Design Response and Methodology: The proposed extension was designed with specific and deliberate measures to minimise its impact on the amenity of No 13 Enda's Road. The measures included the following

- three-dimensional modelling enabling precise assessment of shadow and daylight impact from the earliest stages of the design process.
- boundary setback from the shared boundary reducing the proximity of the extension to the adjoining dwelling and garden.
- A curved roof profile designed to sweep away from No 13, reducing the massing perceived from the adjoining property and mitigating both shadow and visual impact.
- all habitable rooms on the side elevation serve non-habitable spaces and are fitted with obscure glass or positioned at high level to reduce overlooking. The rear elevation box window maintains the required 11m distance from the boundary.
- The works include reconstruction of an existing poorly performing shared foul sewer serving both No's 13 & 14, using oblique junctions and improved falls, delivering a measurable benefit to the adjoining property.
- The existing mature trees to the rear of the property which are not modelled in the shadow analysis, provide additional screening that further reduces the actual impact of the development. The qualitative analysis therefore represents a conservative approach.

Daylight and sunlight and shadow analysis: The assessment addresses all windows and the amenity space of the adjoining property at No 13. The assessment includes Vertical Sky Component (VSC) analysis, Annual Probable Sunlight Hours, and two-hour sunlight to amenity spaces. The results indicate that the proposed development all meet or exceed the applicable BRE threshold. The shadow analysis

confirms that the incremental impact of the extension on surrounding properties is negligible.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

No response to the grounds of appeal were submitted by the planning authority.

7.3. Observations

An observation of the appeal was received from Alan O'Toole & Fiona Murphy, the residents of the adjoining property at No 13 Enda's Road is summarised below:

- Supports the planning authority's decision to refuse permission for the development. There have been repeated failures by the applicant to address the planning authority's concerns regarding the two-storey element of the development in both the current and previous application on the site. The planning authority did not refuse planning permission without prior engagement with the applicant. The planning authority's concerns in the current appeal are neither isolated nor unprecedented. The issue before ACP is therefore not the principle of extending the dwelling but whether the particular form of extension proposed is acceptable in planning terms.
- There is no objection to an appropriate extension and adaptation of existing family homes within the city, but compact growth does not remove the requirement to protect adjoining residential amenity. The planning authority's refusal is consistent with the development plan requirement that residential extensions have regard to context and adjacent residential development.
- The appeal places significant reliance on daylight, sunlight and shadow analysis, which only represent one aspect of residential amenity. Other matters such as outlook, openness, enclosure, visual dominance, sense of enclosure and the quality of private rear garden space require planning judgement in addition to technical assessment.
- The BRE based daylight and sunlight assessment relied upon by the appellants should be considered as one input into the decision-making process. Compliance with technical guidance does not establish that a proposal is acceptable in planning terms. The core issue in this appeal is whether the proposed first floor rear projection is excessive in its relationship to the neighbouring property. The

refusal arose not from an absence of technical information, but from a planning judgement regarding the scale, depth and relationship of the proposed first-floor extension to adjoining residential property.

- The appeal relies on examples of altered and extended properties along Enda's Road. The principal issue is not the appearance of the buildings from the public road. The relevant planning context is the established pattern of rear development and the relationship between dwelling and private rear garden space.
- The terraces along Enda's Road indicates a consistent rear development pattern and rear extension broadly respect a common depth of development (Appendix 1 & 2).
- The proposed first-floor element would introduce a substantial built form extending into the rear of the site in close proximity to the shared boundary with No 13. It would alter the existing relationship between the two properties through its scale, height and visual presence. It would increase the sense of enclosure experienced in the rear garden of No 13 and alter the existing outlook from both the rear garden and rear facing rooms.
- The need for additional family accommodation does not in itself justify a first-floor rear extension where the planning authority have concluded that it would have an overbearing impact on adjoining property.
- The issue before an ACP is not whether additional accommodation is desirable, but whether the form of development strikes an appropriate balance between the needs of the applicants and the protection of adjoining residential property.
- The appeal does not demonstrate that the planning authority's concerns have been overcome. Having regard to the planning authority's assessment, the repeated opportunities to revise the proposal, the established rear development pattern on Enda's Road and the continuing residential amenity concerns the decision to refuse permission should be upheld.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

Having examined all 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, and having inspected the site and its environs, and having regard to the relevant local policies and guidance, I consider the substantive issues to be considered in this appeal relate to the following:

- Principle of the development.
- Impacts on the visual and amenities of the area.
- Reason for refusal

8.2. Principle of the development

The proposed development would reconfigure and enlarge the existing dwelling to provide additional living accommodation at ground and second floor level, which would enhance the level of residential amenity afforded by the dwelling.

Having regard to the residential zoning objective relating to the site and the established use of the site for residential purposes, I accept that the proposed development is acceptable in principle subject to compliance with normal planning considerations and the provisions of the development plan which are considered in more detail below.

8.3. Impacts on the visual and residential amenities of the area.

Before dealing with the substantive issues raised in the appeal which revolve around the planning authority's reason for refusal, I have assessed the proposed development under the relevant standards for residential development set out in the development plan, and the potential for impacts on the amenities of the area.

The house is located at the end of a uniform terrace of 6 no. dwellings. When viewed from the public road the terrace displays a consistent profile with little evidence of significant interventions. The proposed development would not alter this arrangement in that the extension would be largely contained behind the rear building line of the dwelling with only a small projection to the side. It would not impact negatively on the

front elevation of the house or its associated streetscape. I would therefore conclude that significant impacts on the visual amenities of the area would not arise as a result of the proposed development.

The site is adjoined to the north and south by residential properties. The applicants state that preventing overlooking has been a critical consideration in the design of the proposed extension, and I consider that this has been effectively achieved. On the northern elevation at ground floor level, impacts from the corner window serving the living room are removed due to the lower level of the extension and the existing boundary. No windows are proposed first floor level.

On the opposite side, overlooking from the ground floor windows on the southern elevation would be constrained by the existing boundary. There are first floor windows proposed in this elevation serving the master bedroom and an en-suite. These windows serve non habitable spaces and would be fitted with obscure glass.

To the rear a box window is proposed which would face into the rear garden of appellants' house. I accept that the orientation of this window would not facilitate direct overlooking of observers' private amenity space. It also satisfies the 11m separation distance required in the development plan (Section 11.3.1(d)), such that properties to the east are not impacted.

No significant impacts on the amenities of adjoining property would arise due to overlooking with a diminution of the privacy of adjacent property.

In terms of private open space there is a requirement that a rate of not less than 50% of the gross floor area of the residential unit be provided (Section 11.3.1 (c)). There is a significant area of open space to the rear of the house which would not be eroded to any significant degree by the proposed development. A sufficient quantum of private amenity space would be retained for the dwelling.

Under the residential development standards (Section 11.3.1(f)), the distance between side gables and side boundaries should generally be 1.5m. In this case both properties are built up tight to the common boundary on the north side. The proposed new build would be set back from this boundary and comfortably exceed this requirement. On the southern side, while it would be achieved to the rear, the proposed extension would be marginally less than 1m to the front end of the

extension. Having regard to the overall layout of the development and the absence of a building in close proximity on the southern side, I consider that the separation distance is acceptable and would not compromise the amenity of the subject site or neighbouring property.

With regard to vehicular access and car parking, the submitted drawings indicate that the existing pedestrian entrance, and front boundary wall will be retained, which is important in terms of protecting the character of the terrace. The property would continue to rely on roadside parking.

8.4. Reason for refusal

The planning authority's reason for refusal refers to significant overshadowing and the scale of the extension, which would impact on the adjacent property and its rear garden.

The planning authority's concerns regarding overshadowing are not supported by the sunlight/daylight and shadow analysis submitted in support of the application. The sunlight/daylight analysis assessment was carried out using appropriate software (MBS Daylight Software including Radiance daylight simulation package). It includes Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) analysis, supported by Waldram diagrams and Two-Hour Sunlight to Amenity Analysis.

Under the guidelines, assessed windows at adjoining property must achieve a VSC of >27% and where a window falls below this threshold, the VSC must not fall below 80% of its pre-development level. Figure 1 of the assessment provides the results of the VSC, including existing and proposed VSC results for each of the 5 no. windows at the rear of observers property. The results indicate that the VSC for each window should remain above the benchmark criteria of 27% and a ratio of proposed to existing would not fall below 80%. All five windows pass the BRE criteria with the lowest (W2 first floor), marginally above the benchmark criteria of 27%. None of the windows come close to the 80% reduction threshold. The results show that the proposed development would have little impact on the visible sky component from these windows and there would be no noticeable reduction in the amount of skylight to these windows.

Table 2 of the assessment details the results of the APSH. The BRE guidance considers a window to have a potentially noticeable loss of sunlight only if all of the following occurs.

- annual APSH falls below 25%, or 5% in winter.
- the proposed value is less than 80% of the existing value (ratio < 0.80)
- there is also a reduction in annual APSH of more than 4 percentage points.

The result presented in Table 1 indicate that all of the 5 no. windows satisfy the BRE criteria for both annual and winter sunlight and the observers' would not experience a loss of sunlight which would impact on the residential amenity of their dwelling.

Table 3 of the assessment provides the results of the Two-Hour Sunlight to Amenity Analysis. The BRE guidance requires that where garden currently receives at least two hours of sunlight over more than 50% of its area on March 21, it should continue to do after the proposed development. The assessment indicates that the total garden area is 45.94m² and 62% currently receives at least two hours sunlight on March 21. Following the proposed development there would be a marginal reduction in the area receiving sunlight to 57%, which is within acceptable limits and will not result in a significant diminution of the amenity currently enjoyed.

I note that the appeal states that the assessment follows the established guidance set out in the Third Edition and the most current version of the 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice' (BR 209). The Third Edition was published in 2022 and not 2011 as stated the grounds of appeal. However, I note that the assessment complies with BRE 2022 criteria.

A shadow analysis was also completed to assess the potential impacts of the proposed development on the property to the north. It considers typical dates to assess the impact of the proposed development throughout the year (summer/ winter solstice and the spring/autumn equinox as shown on Figures 4,5 & 6). The greatest impact would be experienced during the spring/autumn equinox (March/September 21st). While the applicants' submission states that the shadow cast during this period is confined to the immediate vicinity of the shared boundary, Drawing 25002-PL -09 indicates a slight increase in overshadowing of rear garden at 12.00 and 15.00 hours respectively. The level of increase is insignificant and there would be no increase in

overshadowing at other times of the year, which would significantly impact on appellants garden.

Contrary to the opinion of the planning authority and the views expressed by the observers, I would conclude that there is no evidence that the proposed extension would result in a loss of daylight/sunlight to the 5 no. rear facing windows and the rear amenity space of observers property, or cause a significant increase in overshadowing which would impact significantly on the residential amenity of No 13.

The second part of the planning authority's reason for refusal centres around the overbearing nature of the proposed extension due to its scale, length and height and proximity to the site boundaries. The extension would project by a distance of c 4.8m behind the established rear building line of observers' property and have a maximum ridge height of 6.1m. The distance from the common boundary would range from 1.6m to 2.1m.

The properties within the terrace close to the appeal site have restricted plots with limited areas of private amenity space. Section 3.7 of the development plan (Sustainable Neighbourhoods: Inner Residential Areas) states that it is a priority of the Council to ensure that new development will not affect the character of areas like Shantalla. It requires housing extensions should not be of a scale that represents a major addition to, or redevelopment of the existing urban fabric. It should have regard to the existing pattern of development, plots, blocks, streets and spaces.

Whilst I accept that the applicants have made attempts to address previous concerns expressed by the planning authority and reduced the overall length of the extension and improved separation distances to the northern boundary, the proposal remains significant in the context of adjacent property.

I accept that there is uniformity in the pattern of development along the rear of the terrace and the planning authority have been consistent in its approach to development proposals. While I appreciate appellants need to improve the level of accommodation, I also accept that this cannot be achieved at the expense of the amenity of adjacent properties. I also note that the subject site has the benefit of the largest area of amenity space to the rear and this offers alternatives in terms of an extension to the house. I concur with the observers that the projection is excessive in its relationship with the adjacent property to the north.

Having regard to the existing pattern of development along the rear of the terrace and the restricted area of adjoining plot sizes, I consider that the proposed development by reason of its excessive scale, height and length in close proximity to the northern boundary of the site, would result in an excessive level of overbearance, which would impact on the outlook from the adjoining house and its amenity space, which would result in a significant and adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property. The proposed development, would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable of the area.

Other matters

Uisce Eireann confirms that the sewer that runs along the rear of the site is not one of their assets and there is no requirement for engagement regarding the sewer build over. Should An Coimisiún be minded to grant permission for the development, I recommend that a condition be attached requiring that the sewer be constructed in accordance with details to be submitted for written agreement with the planning authority prior to the commencement of any development on the site.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment

I have considered the proposal to demolish an existing shed and to carry out alterations and additions to the existing dwelling house on the site, and provide connections to public services in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is located at No 14 Endas Road, Shantalla. Galway.

No nature conservation issues were raised in the appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows.

- The location of the development within a built up area of the city,
- the limited scale and nature of the development,
- the distance from the nearest European sites, and

- connections to public services.

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. The proposal is to demolish an existing shed and to carry out alterations and additions to an existing dwelling on the site at 14 Endas Road, Shantalla. Galway.

10.2. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the appeal. There are no water bodies close to the site.

I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.3. Having considered the nature scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface water and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. On the basis of the above assessment, I recommend that permission be refused for the development for the reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the existing pattern of development along the rear of the terrace and the restricted plot sizes of adjoining property, it is considered that the proposed development by reason of its excessive scale, height and length in close proximity to the northern boundary of the site, would result in an excessive

level of overbearance, which would impact on the outlook from the adjoining house and its amenity space, which would result in a significant and adverse impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property. The proposed development, would therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable 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.

Breda Gannon
Planning Inspector

06 August 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501486-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Alterations and additions to existing house
Development Address	14 Enda's Road, Shantalla. 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?	✓ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
(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.	
☒ 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)	
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 ☐	
No ☒	

Inspector: _____

Date: _____