Inspector's Report
PL-501513-RN-26

Development	Change of house design & relocation of the garage permitted under Planning Register Reference Number PD/22/663 (ABP-319526-24) and all necessary site works.
Location	Corraree & Ballygatta, Taughmaconnell, Ballinasloe, Co. Roscommon.
Planning Authority	Roscommon County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660007
Applicant(s)	Ronan & Fiona Kildea
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Ronan & Fiona Kildea
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	19th August 2026
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The 0.679ha greenfield site comprises agricultural land enclosed with hedgerows and drystone stone walls. It is situated in a rural area adjacent to a farmyard and dwelling 6.5km west of the western outskirts of Athlone and 1km north of the Dublin-Galway railway line.

1.2. Access is provided from a local road at the north of the site.

1.3. The site slopes gently from a highpoint at the west down towards the road at the north and down towards the rear boundary at the south with a gentle ridge through the centre from west to east. There is a timber monopole situated in the southwest of the site which carries overhead power cables from east to west as well as northwards.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:

- Change of house design and relocation of garage previously permitted under RCC ref. 22/663, ACP ref.319526-24, and all associated site development works.

2.2. Please note the reference to 'RCC ref. 22/663' is incorrect and should read RCC ref. 23/42. The applicant was requested to clarify this via the further information request as detailed below.

3.0 Planning History

- PD/23/42: Planning permission granted to erect a dwelling house, a domestic garage, to install a septic tank with a percolation area and to construct all ancillary site works to facilitate same. Condition no. 2 of same is as follows:

    1. '*Within three months of the date of the final grant of permission or prior to the commencement of development, whichever is the sooner, a revised site layout plan shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority showing the dwelling relocated to the 65.5m contour line on site. The finished floor level of the dwelling and the contours of the site shall be*

indicated thereon. The development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity, proper planning and development.'

The applicant made a compliance submission, positioning the dwelling on the 65.5m contour line at the south of the site. The Planning Authority considered this did not comply and contended the dwelling should be positioned on the other side of the ridge on the northern 65.5m contour line. The applicant referred the matter to An Bord Pleanála (ABP) to determine the point of detail. and ref. ABP-319526-24 applies. The Inspector's recommended that the submission complied with the requirements of the condition however the Board disagreed. The order states:

'*Having regard to the documentation on file which clearly shows the progression on the site layout and the footprint of the proposed dwelling within the site, it appears that the applicant in allaying the concerns of the planning authority with regard to the overall height of the dwelling sought to move the dwelling forward between the additional information submitted by the applicant to the planning authority on the 11th day August, 2023 and the clarification of additional information received by the planning authority on the 25th day of September, 2023. It would seem more reasonable to assume that the planning authority's intent in attaching condition number 2 was to move the dwelling further forward, a distance of approximately 10 metres in order to relocate the dwelling on 65.5 metres contour line rather than relocate the dwelling a distance 30 metres further to the rear in order to coincide with the 65.5 metres contour to the south-eastern boundary of the site.*

Therefore, having regard to the documentation on file together with the submissions on file the Board considered that, in order to comply with condition number 2 of grant of permission issued by Roscommon County Council on 27th day of October, 2023, the dwelling shall be moved northwards from its location as indicated in the site layout plan submitted to the planning authority on the 25th day of September 2023 so as to be located on the 65.5 metres contour line in the centre of the site.'

4.0 Planning Authority Decision

4.1. Further Information

4.1.1. The Planning Authority requested the following further information from the applicant:

- Clarify the planning register reference as ref. 22/663 was invalidated.
- Clarify the extent of permission sought as the site layout plan suggests it is proposed to also relocate the dwelling which would be at odds with condition no. 2 of the parent permission which specified the location of the dwelling and garage on the site.
- The Planning Authority has serious concerns regarding the proposed location of the dwelling together with its revised two storey design in terms of undue visual impact. The applicant was requested to submit a revised site layout plan and is necessary also revised elevational drawings.
- Wastewater treatment is not illustrated on the site layout plan and therefore the applicant was requested to submit a revised site layout plan which accurately depicts the permitted wastewater system.

4.2. The applicant's response comprised the following:

- Clarification of the planning register reference number.
- Outline of the applicant's rationale for relocating the dwelling to the southwest of the site, which in turn requires slight repositioning of the permitted septic tank and percolation area. The rationale is as follows:
    - Lower visual impact, the placement of a house further away from the public road at the same level will have less visual impact and is in accordance with section 4.4 of the Roscommon Rural Design Guide, relevant extracts provided. A new hedgerow in the 66.5/67.00m ridge will further reduce the visual impact,
    - Remove requirement for installation of a wastewater pumping station and utilise a gravity sewer,
    - Increased solar gain, and reduced overshadowing. Further, placement of the dwelling behind the 66.5/67.00m ridge will shelter from weather,

- Comply with the Inspector's report recommendations,
- Increased privacy,
- No potential for backland development and increased potential to graze land to the northeast thereby retaining the rural character,
- Further, the site is not visible from scenic routes or amenities, is not situated in a sensitive landscape, there is no established building line or reference points in terms of visual impact, no conflict with development patterns, no set back specified in policy and no archaeological matters.

- Permission is also sought to relocate the garage, notwithstanding the fact that the planning authority and An Bord Pleanála were satisfied with its previous position on the 67.00 contour line with a FFL of 66.5m. The revised and reorientated layout would be less prominent in this new lower location.

- The design and layout are predicated upon an earlier ABP Inspector's Report and assessment set out in therein for the parent permission which disagrees with the Planning Authority's position. That Inspector's assessment is based on the Inspector's professional judgment, site visit and technical skills which '*a lay Board with no such expertise would be capable of carrying out'. The Board's reasoning for not accepting the inspector's report is deficient*.'

- The Planning Authority failed to raise concerns regarding the dwelling design which is broadly similar to the permitted design with minor changes. There is no two-storey element proposed but a dormer level is proposed which is similar to the permitted design but reduced in scale, massing and height. Therefore, the planning authority's concerns regarding visual impact are unfounded. The design complies with Sections 6.9 and 6.11 of the Design Guide.

- The submitted site layout plan illustrates the position of the septic tank and percolation area in the same vicinity of the permitted scheme. The Inspector's report assessed the topic of wastewater and concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

- The driveway is now amended in compliance with section 4.1 of the Roscommon County Council Rural Design Guidelines and the dwelling set back is also in compliance with section 4.2 of the guidelines. Extracts are provided and the

response suggests the guidelines lack any reference to placing a dwelling behind a hill.

4.3. Decision

4.3.1. Roscommon County Council issued a notification to refuse permission on 14th May 2026 for one reason as follows:

2. The proposed amended siting, in conjunction with the proposed amended dwelling house design from that permitted under governing permission Planning Ref. No. PD/23/42, would give rise to an unacceptable, visually exposed development at a prominent location in the rural landscape. The proposed amendments fail to comply with the provisions of Section 12.7 (Rural House Design Considerations) of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 and the associated siting and integration principles set out in the accompanying County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines. The proposed amendments to the governing permission, would, if permitted, result in a development which would be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area, would set a precedent for further inappropriate developments of this nature and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4.4. Planning Authority Reports

4.4.1. Planning Reports

- There are two Case Planner's reports on the file, one requesting further information and the latter assessing the response and making a recommendation.
- The 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 for a dwelling was established under the parent permission which remains valid until 26th November 2028. '*Having regard to the foregoing it is considered that proposals to amend the design of this permitted*

development should be considered strategically acceptable, subject to normal planning considerations.'

- The report notes that the revised design is broadly similar to the permitted part single and part two storey design. There are concerns regarding fenestration at the rear which it suggested could be mitigated against via a comprehensive landscaping proposal.

- The report refers to concerns raised in the assessment of the parent permission regarding visual impact which were addressed somewhat by condition no. 2 which required the dwelling to be situated forward of the ridge, thus also reducing the extent of new access track required. It goes on to state that the same concerns remain with the proposed relocation further south again which would result in undue visual impact.

- The second Case Planner's report refers to the ABP point of detail appeal regarding condition no. 2 of the parent permission. It outlines how ABP decided the applicant's submission to position the dwelling on the southern 65m contour line rather than the northern one was not in keeping with the requirements of the condition. It also suggests that the applicant's further information response referring to the ABP Inspector's report only, disregards the Board's decision which overturned the Inspector's recommendation. It states:

> "*Given the fact that the Commission/Board did not accept the Inspector's recommendation, reliance on such an assessment is irrelevant. It remains a case that the Commission/Board made a determination on the required sitting of the dwelling (i.e. to position the dwelling northwards on site to the 65.5m contour line) in order to comply with condition No.2. The current proposal remains contrary to that condition of the governing permission and does not in any way address the concerns of the Planning Authority which motivated the inclusion of condition No.2 in PD/23/42. Those concerns remain pertinent and the proposal presented would give rise to a development which would have an undue vigil impact, with reference to the two-story element of the proposed design at this location."*

- The report suggests that the revised location further back requires an even longer access lane which continues to be an unacceptably obtrusive feature on the landscape.
- It also contends that the revised site layout plan does not illustrate the location of the permitted wastewater system.

4.4.2. Other Technical Reports

- None

4.5. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann: No response.

4.6. Third Party Observations

- None

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).

5.1.2. Policy Objective PPH 3.13 seeks to

> "*Facilitate single houses in rural areas subject to appropriate siting and design criteria, including demonstration of adherence to the principles set out in the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines. In addition, in the case of proposals for single houses in defined Areas under Urban Influence, applicants will be required to demonstrate a social or economic link (as per Table 3.2) to the rural area in which they proposed to build*."

5.1.3. Chapter 12 of the CDP sets out development management standards and section 12.7 therein provides high level layout and dwelling design guidance. It states:

> "*Rural dwellings are required to be designed to a high standard, to complement the character of the landscape, and to contribute in a positive*

manner to the built heritage of the county. Proposals for rural houses shall demonstrate adherence to the principles outlined in the County Roscommon Rural Housing Design Guidelines, and should follow the design process as outlined in the guidelines."

5.2. **County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines**

5.2.1. The design guidelines are a standalone document providing guidance on siting and integration including solar gain and dealing with contours. It recommends that the site should be sheltered and characteristics such as contours, vegetation and site orientation should be to the fore. With specific reference to contours, section 4.1 states

'*It is important for a dwelling to pay particular attention to the existing contours on a site to determine if a specifically designed dwelling can be accommodated on a site, making use of and working with the site levels. Digging out the site can be expensive and the creation an artificial platform can make the site more prominent*.'

5.2.2. Section 4.4 states

'*The sloping contours of a site play an important part when choosing the location of and indeed the specific design of a dwelling for a particular site. A good design approach will work with the existing contours of the site and integrate the dwelling into the site as compared building on the site. Excessive excavation or the creation of an artificial platform can lead to a conspicuous building which is unrelated to the site*.'

5.3. Section 6 relates to new build design and advocates for well-proportioned and simple forms on a narrow plan which are sheltered from the weather, sit comfortably in the landscape and maximise solar gain.

5.4. **Natural Heritage Designations**

5.4.1. Castlesampson Esker Special Area of Conservation and Natural Heritage Area is situated 1.15km northwest of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. 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).

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

- There are 2no. 65.5m contour lines on the site and the applicant wishes to move the dwelling to that at the south, furthest from the public road thereby reducing visual impact by using the low ridge line as screening and retaining more of the site for agricultural use. The proposal seeks to assimilate the dwelling and garage into the rural setting so it is not the dominant feature thereby respecting the natural landscape and affording more privacy to future occupants.

- Positioning the dwelling on the southern 65.5m contour, instead of the northern one, will make no difference from a planning perspective. Moving the dwelling forward as required by condition no. 2 of the parent permission, in isolation of the garage would result in disorderly development. Relocating the garage together with the dwelling as now proposed minimises visual impact. The layout will eliminate potential for future backland development.

- To state that the development would be seriously injurious to the visual amenities of the area is a gross exaggeration of the situation on the ground and misunderstands the concept of integration and siting within the established landscape. There are no conflicts with landscape sensitivity, scenic routes or nearby amenities. There is no established building line and the site is not elevated. There are no other structures or elevated points in the area from the perspective of visual interest.

- The Case Planner's report accepted the design is broadly similar to the permitted design but expressed concerns regarding fenestration on the rear elevation. This was not raised in the further information request (FI Request). The appeal suggests the rear elevation is broadly similar to the permitted rear elevation and is not highly

visible. The appeal also suggests the design complies with the CDP, the rural design guidelines and the Inspector's report findings.

- The FI request outlined a concern with the height of the proposed dormer which is lower than the permitted design. The length has also been shortened resulting in an overall reduction in scale.

- The driveway has been revised in accordance with the rural design guidelines. Semi-mature landscaping will integrate the site into its surroundings.

- The wastewater treatment system is illustrated on the site layout plan in the same location as previously permitted. This revised proposal will not require any pumping station for effluent discharge to the percolation area.

- The reason for refusal suggests a precedent would be set however the issue of precedent does not arise as every application is adjudicated on its own merits.

- The permitted development did not give rise to visual amenity matters and therefore logic implies that a reduced scale of development at the same ground level should reach the same conclusion. There is no basis for the planning authority's decision in light of the permitted development and the ABP Inspector's recommendation for the point of detail referral.

- The Board members did not visit the site when overturning the Inspector's recommendation and made a decision based on a paper exercise. The Inspector is a professional planner assigned to advise on the matter and formed a view that relocating to the southern contour would comply with condition no. 2. All relevant matters were not considered in the assessment of that application. The planning authority should not disregard the findings of the Inspector's report as the professional opinion was reached in light of all the evidence put before it.

- The Inspector was critical of the lack of clarity in the wording of the condition and this reflects the summary manner in which both the permitted and proposed developments were assessed by the planning authority.

- The dwelling would comprise the first dwelling on the landholding in three generations and is required to enable the applicant's own farming activities.

- Photomontages are submitted to demonstrate the impact of siting the dwelling on either 65.5m contour line.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

- None

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Introduction

8.1.1. The proposed development relates solely to layout design changes for a permitted dwelling. In this regard, matters relating to site selection and demonstration of local needs etc are not being revisited and the principle of erecting a dwelling on the site is already established under ref. 23/42.

8.1.2. I note the appeal makes numerous references to the Point of Detail appeal and the findings of the Inspector's report on the matter of which contour line to site the dwelling. The appeal is critical of the planning authority's dismissal of the Inspector's findings as the Board did not adopt the same recommendation. I confirm that this report is a de novo assessment of the matter. I have had regard to the planning history on the site as well as carrying out a site inspection and analysing all relevant policy and guidance, but ultimately the conclusion and recommendation set out below is my own opinion based on the information presented on the file as every application is assessed on its own merits.

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:

- Layout
- Design

8.2. **Layout**

8.2.1. It is proposed to locate the dwelling and garage deep within the site close to the rear (southern) boundary and to the rear of a localised ridge line (67m) running through the site. I consider this has benefits in terms of additional screening from the ridge while also providing opportunities for further landscaping between the structures and the public road.

8.2.2. The applicant submitted photomontages of both the proposed dwelling design on both contours to demonstrate the impact and difference between both. In my opinion these clearly demonstrate that locating the dwelling further back from the road will reduce the visual impact of the development and increase the visual amenity of the area. In this scenario where a dwelling will ultimately be constructed as already permitted, I consider the proposed location further south is more appropriate.

8.2.3. This will result in increased visibility of the dwelling from the south however given the layout of the wider undulating area, and the presence of fields, stone walls and some hedgerows or trees between the site and public roads to the south, I am of the view that the revised layout would not significantly detract from views in this direction. The change in layout would be minor and slight compared to the northern location.

8.2.4. I note the site is not situated in a sensitive landscape or visible from any scenic routes or protected views. I also note there are no sensitive land uses or structures situated on any adjacent land which may be impacted by overlooking or overshadowing etc as all adjacent land is in agricultural use. Further, there are no protected structures or archaeological sites which may be impacted by moving the dwelling 70m southwest.

8.2.5. The County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines recommend retaining natural features such as the ridge and utilising them to embed the development into the landscape.

8.2.6. I note the revised dwelling location will necessitate a longer driveway through the centre of the site and it is not clear if it is proposed maintain the ground level and travel over the ridge line or cut through it. I consider cutting through the ridge would be acceptable but only for the width of the access in order to retain the shape of this natural landscape feature. I recommend a condition is attached requiring the ridge

and all other ground levels to be maintained with the exception of the footprint of the access track.

8.2.7. For clarity, I note the site layout plan states the garage will have a finished floor level of 69.75 which I consider is a likely typographical error as the existing ground level in this location is 66.5 - 70m while the FFL of the adjacent dwelling is suggested to be 65.90m. I recommend a condition is attached requiring the garage to have the same FFL as the dwelling at 65.90m.

8.2.8. On the matter of wastewater treatment I note a septic tank and percolation area was permitted under ref. 23/42 in the southwest corner of the site. The proposed site layout drawing illustrates approximately the same layout, albeit with some minor revisions including the omission of a need for a pumping station as the revised location can be serviced by gravity. I note that all relevant separation distances are met in the revised design and in this regard I consider the revised layout to be acceptable.

8.2.9. In conclusion I consider siting the dwelling and garage further south as proposed would represent a more appropriate layout better protecting the visual amenity of the area and adhering to guidance provided in the rural design guide. In my opinion the development therefore complies with Policy Objective PPH 3.13 and section 12.7 of the CDP.

8.3. **Design**

8.3.1. The permitted dwelling design comprised two wings set out in a T-shape with a single storey living space at the east and two storey sleeping quarters at the west. The permitted design had elements of larch cladding and breakfront gables on the rear. The proposed design retains the same principles with some alterations as follows:

- Omission of all timber cladding.
- Proposal to finish the front elevation of the two storey gable with stone as well as addition of a new single storey, stone-clad breakfront gable on the front elevation in lieu of a similar sized section of the permitted narrow plan dwelling which was to be finished with timber cladding.

- Revision of fenestration throughout including relocation of the front door. Permitted cathedral style gable glazing is retained but situated in different locations.

- Minor internal alterations to the floorplan but the overall layout has similar principles with living space in the single storey wing and sleeping arrangements in the two storey wing, albeit with a new ground floor ensuite bedroom situated at the east and a new integrated overhang providing an outdoor living area on the rear elevation. This overhang comprises an extension of the roof onto two squared columns finished with the same render as the main dwelling but with open sides forming a large porch type feature.

8.3.2. This has the overall effect of reducing the two storey height from 7.42m to 7.11m but increasing the height of the single storey element from 5.1m to 5.6m. The length will be reduced from 27m to 24m. In this regard it is evident that the overall scale of the dwelling would reduce and I agree with the applicant's position on this matter that the visual impact would therefore also reduce, particularly when regard is had to its location set back further from the public road.

8.3.3. The revised design is very similar to the permitted dwelling and is a simple shape drawing on vernacular forms and arrangement, but provides a more contemporary approach which complies with the guidance provided in the rural design guidelines.

8.3.4. I note section 7.8 of the rural design guide recommends avoiding the addition of stone cladding which clearly reads as non-structural. In this regard I recommend the side elevations are also finished with stone to give the intended impression that the entire wings are separate structures. This will serve to break up the mass of the dwelling and avoid a 'tacked on' approach when stone is only added to one elevation.

8.3.5. The remaining external materials and finishes should also comply with the rural design guidelines including the use of natural slate, timber windows and door and dark coloured fascia, soffits and rainwater goods.

8.3.6. It is proposed to finish the c.60m^2 pitched roof garage with nap render and a 'tiled or slated roof'. I recommend a condition is attached requiring the finishes to match the dwelling.

8.3.7. In conclusion, I consider the revised dwelling and garage design complies with the rural design guidance and would represent an acceptable form of development in the rural area.

9.0 AA Screening

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

9.2. The proposed development is located within an unserviced rural area and comprises a revised dwelling design and site layout together with associated works such as access lane and on-site wastewater treatment as previously permitted. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is Castlesampson Esker Special Area of Conservation (SAC), located 1.1km northwest 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, and
- The location of the development in a rural area 1.1km from European Sites,
- The rural nature of intervening habitats and 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 undertaken with regard tothe objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive, together with

relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality.

10.2. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, it is concluded that the proposal will not result in any risk of deterioration in the status of any water body, including surface waters (rivers and lakes), groundwater, transitional waters, or coastal waters. This applies to both qualitative and quantitative status, and in respect of temporary and permanent effects.

10.3. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with EPA codes of practice and best practice guidance, ensuring that appropriate measures are incorporated to prevent pollution, control runoff, and protect both surface water and groundwater receptors.

10.4. Furthermore, the development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the maintenance or attainment of Good Ecological Status/Potential and Good Chemical Status, as required under the Directive.

10.5. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be 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 site in a rural area set within a moderate sensitivity landscape, the provisions of the Roscommon County Development Plan 2022-2028 including section 12.7 and Policy Objective PPH 3.13 as well as the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines, the pattern of 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 and would successfully integrate

into the landscape. 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, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 04th day of March 2026, 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.	Apart from any departures specifically authorised by this permission, the development shall comply with the conditions of the parent permission Register Reference 23/42 unless the conditions set out hereunder specify otherwise. This permission shall expire on the same date as the parent permission. Reason: In the interest of clarity and to ensure that the overall development is carried out in accordance with the previous permission(s).
3.	(a) The roof of the proposed house shall be blue-black, black, dark brown or dark-grey natural slate. The colour of the ridge tile shall be the same as the colour of the roof. (b) The external rendered walls shall be finished in neutral colours such as grey or off-white. (c) All stone shall be local and natural with no reconstituted stone to be fitted externally.

	(d) All window surrounds and doors shall be timber. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and compliance with the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines.
4.	(a) The side elevations of the dwelling shall be finished in the same stone as the gables on the front elevation. (b) The garage external materials and finishes of the garage shall match the dwelling. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and compliance with the County Roscommon Rural Design Guidelines.
5.	The garage shall have a finished floor level of 65.90m in accordance with the finished floor level of the dwelling. Any alteration to this shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority in advance of the commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of clarity and visual and architectural amenity.
6.	All ground levels outside the footprint of the development shall be maintained in full. The finished level of the access driveway shall replicate the existing contours of the site insofar as is possible with alterations to the existing ground levels only permitted within the footprint of the driveway itself. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

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

16 October 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	501513-RN-26
Proposed Development Summary	Change of house design
Development Address	Corraree and Ballygatta, Taughmaconnell, Ballinasloe, Co. 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.**	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.
☐ 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**

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	**Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)**
No ☒	**Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)**

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____