Inspector's Report
PL-501588-GY-26

Development	To construct (i) Slatted tank, (ii) Cubicle shed with slatted tank, (iii) Silage slab and all associated site works.
Location	Gortroe, Ardrahan, Co. Galway.
Planning Authority	Galway County Council.
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660511.
Applicant(s)	John & Darragh Callanan.
Type of Application	Permission.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions.
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal.
Appellant(s)	Joe Callanan.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	10th September 2026.
Inspector	C. Daly.

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject rectangular site, of area 0.2794ha., consists of a farm yard with a number of farm sheds including a milking parlour, calf shed, cubicle and storage sheds and silage pit. The site is accessed from the west via a short driveway from the L-8567 local road. A grass field separates the site from a detached bungalow dwelling to the west. The site is otherwise surrounded by grass agricultural fields to the north, east and south.

1.2. The rural site is c.4km from the village of Ardrahan. Ringfort - Cashel (GA104219) is to the north-east of the subject site and the site is outside its zone of influence per the National Monuments Service mapping.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. The proposed development, in summary, consists of the following:

- Construction of a slatted tank, pitched roof cubicle shed with slatted tank and rectangular silage slab.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. Galway County Council decided to grant permission subject to 10 no. conditions.

3.1.2. Notable conditions include:

- Condition no. 3 requires that the agricultural structures be used solely for agricultural purposes associated with the running of the farm and shall not be used for any commercial activity separate from the operation of the farm.
- Condition no. 5 requires that all foul effluent, soiled waters and slurry generated from the development and farm yard be managed and conveyed through properly constructed channels to appropriate storage facilities. No effluent, soiled waters, farm effluent or slurry shall discharge or be allowed to discharge to any stream, river or watercourse or to the public road.

- Condition no. 6 requires that all uncontaminated water be disposed of within the site and that only clean uncontaminated storm water be discharged to the surface water management system.
- Condition no. 8 requires the development and land spreading to be carried out in accordance with the EU GAP regulations.
- Condition no. 9 requires that waste from the development shall not be land spread during or immediately after periods of unusual heavy rainfall, on frozen ground, on lands subject to flooding or at any time during which there would be heavy surface water run-off.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. The Planner's Report assessment noted that sufficient details were supplied of existing farm lands in the Nutrient Management Plan (NMP)/ Fertiliser Plan and in relation to animal types and nutrient management and that the principle of the development is acceptable. It notes that the NMP outlines there is ample storage available for the development.

3.2.2. It notes the soakpits for surface water disposal and that access is via an existing agricultural entrance. It noted that the new shed would be to the rear of the existing entrance and integrated with the existing agricultural sheds with the external finishes considered to be commonly used in the county. The design was considered acceptable and it recommended permission be granted subject to 10 no. conditions.

3.2.3. Other Technical Reports

- Environment Section: No report received.
- Gort Area Office: No report received.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- The Heritage Council: No response received.
- An Taisce: No response received.
- Development Applications Unit: No response received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was received which can be summarised as follows:

- There are inaccuracies in the land holdings submitted outlined in blue with some of the lands in the ownership of the third party observer.
- In these circumstances it is not appropriate for the P.A. to determine the application and F.I. should be sought on this matter.

4.0 Planning History

21/525: Permission granted by the P.A. to construct two cubicle sheds with underground effluent tank, calf shed, silage slab and storage shed.

12/106: Permission granted by the P.A. for the construction of a milking parlour, drafting area, waiting yard, meal bin, underground slurry tank, water tank and the retention of an existing slatted shed (GFA 478.56sqm; retention 177.12sqm).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028 (the CDP)

The site is located in an area designated as a Class 1 'low' landscape and within the central Galway landscape.

Chapter 15 – Development Management Standards

DM Standard 13: Agricultural Buildings

In dealing with planning applications for such buildings the Planning Authority will have regard to:

a) Design and Layout

The quality of design and layout of the farm complex. Where possible new buildings, shall be located within or adjoining the existing farmyard complex. Buildings shall be of minimum scale and use of muted coloured materials shall be encouraged.

b) Residential Amenity

The proximity of any existing dwelling house.

c) Public Road Access

The safe access to public roads.

d) Rural Landscape

The assimilation of the buildings into the rural landscape by means of appropriate siting, external colouring, screening and shelter belting.

DM Standard 17: Rural Enterprise

This includes consideration for the provision of rural enterprises including farm related business in rural areas. It requires, inter alia, the submission of arrangements for the storage and collection of waste and that there should not be any adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings.

DM Standard 47: Field Patterns, Stone Walls, Trees and Hedgerows

This seeks for new developments in rural areas, inter alia, the retention and incorporation of existing field patterns and associated stone walls, trees and hedgerows and that only minimum interference to be permitted.

DM Standard 50: Environmental Assessments

In respect of designated environmental sites, this requires appropriate assessment, ecological assessment and environmental impact assessment.

5.2. **National Policy**

S.I. No. 119/2026 - European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2026 refers to standards for disposal and collection of farm waste based on the Government's Nitrates Action Programme which seeks to protect waters from pollution arising from agriculture.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

In relation to designated sites, the subject site is located:

- c.1km east of Castletaylor Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000242).
- c.2.4km south-eat of Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089).
- c.2.4km south-east of Rahasane Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 000322).
- c.3km north-east of Ardrahan Grassland SAC (site code 002244).

- c.3.8km east of Kiltiernan Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 001285).
- c.4km east of Lough Fingall Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000606).
- c.6.1km north-west of Peterswell Turlough SAC and PNHA (site code 000318).
- c.6.4km south-east of Galway Bay Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000268).
- c.6.9km north of Ballinduff Turlough SAC (site code 002295).
- c.7.3km north-west of Slieve Aughty Mountains SPA (site code 004168).
- c.7.6km north of Lough Coy SAC (site code 002117).
- c.7.6km north of Carrowbaun, Newhall and Ballylee Turloughs SAC (site code 002293).
- c.7.7km north-east of Coole-Garryland Complex SAC and PNHA (site code 000252).
- c.9.05km north-east of Cahermore Turlough SAC (site code 002294).

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The grounds of the third party appeal by Joe Callanan can be summarised as follows:

- The conclusion of the P.A. that the applicant demonstrated the lands within the blue line area are within his ownership are not correct and the applicants were given the opportunity to rectify this.
- The appellant has no objection in principle to the development provided the ownership and boundary issues are accurately resolved.
- The Planner's Report fails to acknowledge his third party observation despite it being made and receipted which suggests that the observation was overlooked and not considered.
- The inclusion of lands not within the applicants' ownership or control is a significant defect in the application documentation.

- The P.A. erred in granting permission on the basis of inaccurate ownership information and without proper regard to the third party observation.
- Planning permission should therefore be refused.
- Enclosed third party observation and receipt.
- Attached land ownership correspondence with the applicant's agent and map extracts and folios.

6.2. **Applicant Response**

The response to the appeal on behalf of the applicant can be summarised as follows:

- The development is vital to the family farm and is solely designed to improve water quality under the Nitrates Action Program.
- The proposed works do not rely on, access, or physically touch any lands belonging to the appellant.
- The lands in question were transferred from the family farm to the appellant in 1985 so he could build his own dwelling. This never occurred and the plot has remained in agricultural use and in the control of the family farm since.
- The appellant has no independent access to the disputed land and his only means of access is via trespass on their land or via a new entrance at a dangerous bend on the public road.
- When informed of the blue line issue, their agent amended the map and sent it to the Council and the appellant responded with thanks.
- The only land they own is within the red line boundary and they acted in good faith to resolve the issue.
- The lands in question have not been maintained and this issue arises from the third party's perception that they are claiming ownership.
- The appeal is vexatious and is designed to obstruct their agricultural operations and cause financial and material damage to their farm and business.

- The appellant stated he has no issue with the development but stated that it should be refused on grounds that do not exist.
- The proposed development does not impact the appellant, his lands or the ownership of his lands in any way.
- The Commission is asked to dismiss the appeal so they can proceed with the sustainable development of their family farm and business.
- Attached email correspondence including advice of email correspondence from the appellant and that they responded with an updated boundary map.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

None received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Request to Dismiss Appeal
- Principle of Development
- Agricultural Policy
- Other Matters

7.2. **Request to Dismiss Appeal**

7.2.1. I note the applicants in their response to the third party appeal requested that the third party appeal be dismissed noting the nature of the appeal and what they state is the absence of grounds for refusal of permission. I note that Section 138 of the 2000 Act provides the Commission with the power to dismiss an appeal where, inter alia, it considers the grounds of the appeal to be vexatious, frivolous or without substance or foundation.

7.2.2. Having considered the grounds of appeal where I note an absence of the raising of substantive planning matters, the Commission may wish to consider if the third party appeal is vexatious, frivolous or without substance or foundation and if it should be dismissed. I will proceed to assess the planning merits of the application below.

7.3. **Principle of Development**

7.3.1. I note the site location within an unzoned agricultural and rural area significantly removed from the closest settlement. I note CDP policies which seek to support agriculture and food production. Subject to adherence to CDP policies on siting, the protection of amenities and environmental protection, give the agricultural type of development proposed in an existing farm yard adjacent to agricultural fields, I consider the type of use to be acceptable in principle.

7.4. **Agricultural Policy**

7.4.1. I note the support of the CDP for agriculture and rural enterprise including in DM Standard 17. I note the design of the proposed cubicle shed, including slatted tank, with pitched roof to a height of 7.59m and eaves height of 4.315m which would be perpendicular to the pitched roof of the adjacent existing shed of lower ridge height. The floor area would be 138sqm. I note this is marked as area A on the site layout plan and that it would also be adjacent to a cubicle shed to the north which is adjacent to the milking parlour.

7.4.2. I note the slatted sides and roof and lower concrete wall element and the green colour of the slatted materials which are consistent with the typology of such agricultural buildings in the county. Having visited the site and observed these existing buildings, I consider that the proposed new cubicle shed would integrate with these buildings and with the buildings to the north and with the farm yard being of a similar design and form to the existing buildings on the site. I note there would also be a new slatted tank (silage pit to north on site layout plan) which would not be particularly visible above ground level.

7.4.3. I note that the proposed rectangular silage slab adjacent to an existing silage pit which is adjacent to farm buildings to the west would not be particularly visible outside the site and would be of a design form consistent with the agricultural yard function of the subject site. Overall, in visual impact terms I am satisfied that the proposed development would integrate with the site, the surroundings and with the

rural landscape. Should permission be granted, I recommend a standard condition for the agreement of detailed external finishes.

7.4.4. Noting this and that it would not be excessively close to residences in the vicinity and that it would use an existing agricultural entrance, I am satisfied that the proposed development would be consistent with DM Standard 13 (Agricultural Buildings) of the Development Plan. I note that there would be no alteration of field patterns or boundaries as part of the proposed development such that I am satisfied that it would be consistent with DM Standard 47 of the CDP.

7.4.5. I note that DM Standard 17 (Rural Enterprise) requires the submission of arrangements for storage and collection of waste and in relation to impacts on residential amenities. I note the submitted NMP prepared by Tarpey and Associates. This outlines the number of cattle which totals to 265 animals. I note the appeal concerns the purported inclusion of the appellant's land holding to the south-west.

7.4.6. I consider that this matter could potentially be related to the issue of land spreading if lands located within the blue line area were specifically identified to be required to be used by the proposed development for such purpose or be related to amenity. I note that the application does not identify the lands required for land spreading. In this report I have not identified any significant issues that would affect the area, which includes the disputed blue line site.

7.4.7. I note the slurry storage facilities incorporated with capacity noted in the NMP. I note that the applicant is legally obliged to adhere to the GAP Regulations 2026 and ACP is not the competent authority for land spreading. I note that only lands where the GAP Regulations (2026) limitations can be met can be used for the purpose of land spreading. I note that reliance on the GAP regulations for the control of land spreading is not a mitigation measure for the purpose of preventing a significant effect on any European site as this is governed by regulation and applies to all land where spreading takes place in order to prevent pollution to surface water and ground water.

7.4.8. In relation to environmental impact, particularly potential water and groundwater pollution, I note that it would be required by the GAP regulations 2026 to adhere to water pollution standards which are for the purpose of avoiding water pollution. Should permission be granted, I recommend standard conditions to ensure this.

Noting this, the incorporation of slurry storage facilities and that land spreading would be required to be in accordance with best practice regulatory standards, and that a standard SUDS condition can be required to ensure surface water drainage does not result in any pollution, I consider that the proposed development would not result in any on-site or off-site pollution. This would accord with DM Standard 17 (rural enterprise) of the CDP.

7.4.9. I note correspondence on the file from the applicants with a blue line shown around the disputed area of land to the south-west of the subject site. I note this could still be read as being located within the blue line area as there is a blue line on four of its sides. However, I note that the land area in dispute is outside the red line area such that the entitlement of the applicants to carry out the development is not in dispute.

7.4.10. Noting this and my assessment below in relation to matters related to land spreading, I do not consider that there are grounds for refusing permission in relation to a lack of title or consent.

7.5. Other Matters

7.5.1. I note the appeal raises an issue in relation to there being no reference to his observation in the P.A. Planner's Report. I can confirm that reference to the observation was omitted although I note that the Planner's Report was satisfied that the lands were in the ownership of the applicants. I have considered the issues raised by the third party in this appeal above and below and I am therefore satisfied that no significant issue arises in relation to this issue.

8.0 EIA Screening

8.1. 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 Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Please refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of this report.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening (see Form 2 – Appendix 2), I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Castletaylor Complex SAC (site code 000242), Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089) and Rahasane Turlough SAC (site code 000322) European Sites in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required. This determination is based on:

- The nature of the works.
- The location and distance from the nearest European sites.
- The required adherence to the GAP regulations.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive (see Form 3 – Appendix 3), together with relevant guidance published by the Environmental Protection Agency (Ireland), including applicable codes of practice for the protection of water quality. This assessment had regard to land spreading.

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 can be 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. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with the requirements of Article 4.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be granted subject to conditions.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the provisions of the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, the location within an existing rural agricultural area, to the nature and scale of the development and its relationship with adjacent development and the surrounding area including water bodies in the vicinity, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the development would be acceptable and would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of design, visual and residential amenity, public health and environmental impact. The development is, therefore, considered to 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 building shall be used for agricultural/horticultural storage and associated purposes only. The building shall not be used for human habitation or any commercial purpose other than a purpose incidental to farming/horticulture, whether or not such use might otherwise constitute exempted development.
   Reason: In the interest of orderly development and the amenities of the area.

3. Details of the finishes of the agricultural shed shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.
   Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

4. (a) A management schedule for the operation of the slatted shed shall be submitted to the planning authority, prior to the housing of animals in the facility.
   (b). The management schedule shall comply with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2026, or, if superseded by subsequent regulations.
   (c) The management schedule shall provide for:
   - the number, age and types of animals to be housed,
   - arrangements for the disposal of slurry,
   - arrangements for the storage and disposal of manure and
   - the cleansing of buildings and structures, including the public road, where relevant.
   Reason: In order to prevent pollution and in the interest of amenity.

5. (a) Slurry generated by the proposed development shall be disposed of by spreading on land, or by other means acceptable in writing to the planning authority. The location, rate and time of spreading (including prohibited times for spreading) and the buffer zones to be applied shall be in accordance with the requirements of S.I. No. 119/2026 - European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2026.
   (b) Where slurry or manure generated by the proposed development is moved to other locations, details of such movements are to be notified to the

Department of Agriculture, Food & the Marine in accordance with the S.I. No. 119/2026 - European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2026.
(c) Where a slurry or manure is removed by a third party, by agreement, to be land spread elsewhere, details of such an agreement (to include name of third party, lands to be spread, amounts of material) should be furnished to the local authority in which said lands are located.
Reason: To ensure the satisfactory disposal of waste material, in the interest of amenity, public health and to prevent pollution of watercourses.

6. All foul effluent and slurry generated by the development and in the farmyard shall be conveyed through properly constructed channels to the proposed and existing storage facilities and no effluent or slurry shall discharge or be allowed to discharge to any stream, river or watercourse, or to the public road.
Reason: In the interest of public health and the environment.

7. Water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including the disposal of surface and soiled water, shall comply with the requirements of the Planning Authority for such works and services. In this regard -
(a) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of directly in a sealed system to ground in appropriately sized soakaways.
(b) all soiled waters shall be directed to an appropriately sized soiled water storage tank (in accordance with the requirements of the S.I. No. 119/2026 - European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2026 or to a slatted tank. Drainage details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, prior to commencement of development.
(c) all separation distances for potable water supplies as outlined in the S.I. No. 119/2026 - European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2026 shall be strictly adhered to.
Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and public health.

8. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer or any agent acting on its behalf, shall prepare a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP) as set out in the EPA's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021) including demonstration of proposals to adhere to best practice and protocols. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness; these details shall be placed on the file and retained as part of the public record. The RWMP must be submitted to the planning authority for written agreement prior to the commencement of development. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at the site office at all times.
   Reason: In the interest of proper planning and sustainable development.

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.

Ciarán Daly
Planning Inspector

16th September 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501588-GY-26
Proposed Development Summary	To construct (i) Slatted tank, (ii) Cubicle shed with slatted tank, (iii) Silage slab and all associated site works.
Development Address	Gortroe, Ardrahan, Co. Galway.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ 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**	**State the Class here**

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**	**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: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2 – AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment **Test for likely significant effects**	
Case Reference Number: PL-501588-GY-26	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics Construction of a slatted tank, pitched roof cubicle shed with slatted tank and rectangular silage slab on a farm yard site adjacent to agricultural fields and separated from a dwelling by a small grass field.	
Brief description of project	Construction of a slatted tank, pitched roof cubicle shed with slatted tank and rectangular silage slab.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Site area 0.2794ha., consists of a farm yard with a number of farm sheds including a milking parlour, calf shed, cubicle and storage sheds and silage pit. A grass field separates the site from a detached bungalow dwelling to the west. The site is otherwise surrounded by grass agricultural fields to the north, east and south.
Screening report	N
Natura Impact Statement	N
Relevant submissions	None
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model	

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests[1] Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections[2]	Consider further in screening[3] Y/N
Castletaylor Complex SAC (site code 000242).	Turloughs [3180] Alpine and Boreal heaths [4060] Juniperus communis formations on heaths or calcareous grasslands [5130] Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites) [6210]	c.1km to the west	None. No hydrological connection.	N

	Limestone pavements [8240] Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 20th December 2021			
Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089).	Whooper Swan (Cygnus cygnus) [A038] Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140] Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) [A156] Greenland White-fronted Goose (Anser albifrons flavirostris) [A395] Wigeon (Mareca penelope) [A855] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999] Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 27th January 2023	c.2.4km to the north-west	None. No hydrological connection.	N

Rahasane Turlough SAC (site code 000322).	Turloughs [3180] Conservation Objectives, NPWS, 16th December 2020	c.2.4km to the north-west	None. No hydrological connection.	N

[1] Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

[2] Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

[3] if no connections: N

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

AA Screening matrix

I note the slurry storage facilities incorporated with the capacity noted in the NMP. I note that the applicant is legally obliged to adhere to the GAP Regulations 2026 and ACP is not the competent authority for land spreading. Reliance on the GAP regulations for the control of land spreading is not a mitigation measure for the purpose of preventing a significant effect on any European site as this is governed by regulation and applies to all land where spreading takes place in order to prevent pollution to surface water and ground water.

I note the purpose of these regulations is to prevent water pollution.

I note that only lands where the GAP Regulations (2026) limitations can be used for the purpose of land spreading. I am satisfied that no risk of water pollution arises either individually or cumulatively. In this context, I do not consider that any cumulative impacts would arise in relation to impacts on European sites.

Site name Qualifying interests	**Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site***	
	Impacts	**Effects**
Site 1: Name (code) QI list		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y/N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
	Impacts	**Effects**
Site 2: Name (code) QI list		
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): Y/N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?	
***Where a restore objective applies it is necessary to consider whether the project might compromise the objective of restoration or make restoration more difficult.		
Further Commentary / discussion (only where necessary)		

Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Castletaylor Complex SAC (site code 000242), Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089) and Rahasane Turlough SAC (site code 000322).
The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.
No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Castletaylor Complex SAC (site code 000242), Rahasane Turlough SPA (site code 004089) and Rahasane Turlough SAC (site code 000322) European Sites in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature of the works.
- The location and distance from the nearest European sites.
- The required adherence to the GAP regulations.

Appendix 3

Water Framework Directive

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT SCOPING TABLE			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Coimisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-501588-GY-26	**Townland, address**	Gortroe, Ardrahan, Co. Galway.
Description of project		To construct (i) Slatted tank, (ii) Cubicle shed with slatted tank, (iii) Silage slab and all associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		There are no hydrological surface water pathways running across the farm yard site.	
Proposed surface water details		Soakpits included for roofs of sheds.	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Existing private well.	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		N/A	
Others?		N/A	

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection							
Identified water body	**Water body name(s) (code)**	**WFD Status**	**Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk**	**Identified pressures on that water body**	**Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater) (Consider all phases)**	**Mitigation Measures proposed**	**Is mitigation sufficient? Will there be any residual impacts?**
Ground	Clarinbridge (IE_WE_G_0008)	Good	Not at risk	None significant	Drainage to ground	SUDS measures for surface water run-off, slurry storage facilities provided, compliance with best agricultural practices including for land spreading.	Mitigation is sufficient, there will be no residual impacts.
River	Kilcolgan_040 (IE_WE_29K010600)	Poor	At risk	Septic tanks and agriculture are significant.	No connection other than via groundwater which would be too weak.	SUDS measures for surface water run-off, slurry storage facilities provided, compliance with best agricultural practices including for land spreading.	Mitigation is sufficient, there will be no residual impacts.