Inspector's Report
PL-501616-GC-26

Development	Permission for development which consists of; subdivision of residential site to construct two detached houses with detached garages and additional driveway access
Location	No 7 Cuirt Cherin , Circular Road , Galway
Planning Authority	Galway City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2660101
Applicant(s)	Sandoval Developments Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Ronan O' Sullivan
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	27th August 2026
Inspector	Sandra Eapen

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description 4

2.0 Proposed Development 4

3.0 Planning Authority Decision 4

3.1. Decision 4

3.2. Planning Authority Reports 5

3.3. Prescribed Bodies 6

3.4. Third Party Observations 6

4.0 Planning History 7

5.0 Policy Context 7

5.1. Galway City Council Development Plan 2023-29 (including variation no. 3) 7

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024 8

5.3. Ministerial Guidelines: Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines 2007 9

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations 9

6.0 EIA Screening 9

7.0 The Appeal 10

7.1. Grounds of Appeal 10

7.2. Applicant Response 11

7.3. Planning Authority Response 12

8.0 Assessment 12

8.1. Principle of Development 12

8.2. Design and Residential Amenity 13

8.3. Overbearing, Overlooking and Overshadowing 18

8.4. Traffic and Road Safety 18
8.5. Other Matters 20
8.6. Conclusion 20
9.0 AA Screening 20
10.0 Water Framework Directive 21
11.0 Recommendation 22
12.0 Reasons and Considerations 22
13.0 Conditions 22
Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening 26
Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination 29

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The subject appeal is made in relation to a site measuring c.0.16ha located within a suburban housing development, c.2.5km northeast of Galway City. The site is an undeveloped plot located within an existing housing development and remains devoid of any built structures. The site is bound by low masonry walls and has 1 no. vehicular entrance c.3.7m wide. The subject site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac with a turning area provided at the end. Neighbouring sites has large dormer bungalow style dwellings with no uniform style or design.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is being sought for the subdivision of residential site, 1687sqm, and for the construction of two no. detached houses with detached garages (c.628sqm total) and additional driveway access c.3.7m.

2.2. The 2 no. detached houses are proposed to have part 2 and part single storey height. House no. 1 is proposed to have a floor area of 309sqm and maximum roof ridge height of c.7.85m. House no. 2 is proposed to have a floor are of 283sqm and a maximum roof ridge height of c.7.95m. Finishes indicated primarily include render and brick cladding.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Planning permission was granted for the development by Galway City Council on 24 June 2026.

The following conditions were applied by the Planning Authority:

Condition no. 2 – Requires first floor bathroom windows to be glazed and top hung

Condition no. 3 – Requires roof finishes to be in black and all finishes to be agreed.

Condition no. 4– Sets limits to boundary heights and requires finishes to be agreed.

Condition no. 5– Entrance gates shall not open outwards.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The **first report** (dated 30/4/2026) issued by the Planning Authority noted that the proposed subdivision of sites is acceptable on this site as the current site zoning as R2 allows for increased densities at this location. The size and scale of the development were acceptable in this instance given the large site. No overshadowing impacts were considered likely. The design including the proposed gable frontage, private open space provision, proposed separation distance and distance between buildings were acceptable. However, a street section drawing showing the proposed dwellings in context and clarification regarding proposed Uisce Éireann connections were requested as Further Information. Further Information was sought regarding the following items:

1. Applicant was requested to engage with Uisce Eireann through a Pre-Connection Enguiry (PCE) process. The outcome of which was to be submitted to the Planning Authority.
2. Revised proposal repositioning garages off the site boundaries requested.
3. Street elevation section was requested showing existing adjacent dwellings, including finished floor levels and ridge heights.

A **second report** (dated 11/06/2026) is the basis for the decision to grant permission for the proposed development. The applicant in response to the Further Information request submitted details of engagement with Uisce Éireann. Revised drawings showing garage for the dwellings repositioned and street section showing proposed dwelling including ridge level heights were also submitted as Further Information response by the applicant. The revised proposal and other details submitted were considered acceptable.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Transport Department: No objections subject to conditions

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Éireann

First report dated 01/04/2026 request Further Information and request applicant to engage with Uisce Éireann through the Pre Connection Enquiry (PCE) to assess the feasibility of connections.

Second Report dated 05/06/2026 states that the applicant has engaged with Uisce Éireann via a Pre-Connection Enquiry (CDS26004323 & CDS26004324) and that a Confirmation of Feasibility has been issued to the applicant advising that water and wastewater connections are feasible at the site without infrastructure upgrade. Standard connection agreement conditions are recommended.

3.4. Third Party Observations

Three no. third party submissions were received at application stage including appellant. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Location of the shed could impact adjoining boundaries and trees
- Proposed development is out of character and request the 2-storey element be omitted from the development or kept to 1 and1/2 storey dormer building
- Proposal is contrary to established character and relationship between dwellings
- Overdevelopment of site, significant footprint, visual and built elements are noticeable more intensive and dominant at this location.
- Two vehicular entrances proposed would reduce openness, visibility and manoeuvrability contrary to DMURS
- Increase traffic, noise and general disturbance on adjoining site and increase construction traffic, deliveries, parking etc raising safety concerns
- Would set an undesirable precedent for similar subdivision of plots in the estate
- Proposed ridge height is out of character
- Detached garages are stated in the development description but not indicated in the submitted drawings
- Retaining wall on subject site is not indicated in the drawings submitted.

- Residential amenity, privacy and outlook of adjoining properties are impacted

4.0 Planning History

Parent permission for the estate

Reg. Ref. 14/240 Permission granted for the construction of 24 no. detached 1½ storey houses on serviced sites as previously permitted under Reg. Ref. 06/322 and Reg. Ref. 07/933. Extension of Duration of permission was granted for sites 7 and 11 permitted under Reg. Ref. 14/240 until February 2025 under Reg. Ref. 19/351.

A number of individual houses within the development have been subject to modifications. Non-exhaustive list provided below

- Reg. Ref. 18/268 - No. 28 Cuirt Cheirin.
- Reg. Ref. 17/219 - No. 23 Cuirt Cheirin.
- Reg. Ref. 17/268 - No. 6 Cuirt Cheirin
- Reg. Ref. 16/200 - No. 2 Cuirt Cheirin
- Reg. Ref. 16/18 - No. 4 Cuirt Cheirin

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Galway City Council Development Plan 2023-29 (including variation no. 3)

The site is located within lands zoned as R2- Residential 2 Areas in the Galway City Development Plan 2023-29. The objective for R2 zoning is "*To provide for sensitive residential infill where such infill will not have an impact on the environmental and visual sensitivities in the area, including those in particular the subject of Policy 5.2 and where such infill can be assimilated satisfactorily through design, layout and amenity impact in a manner that does not detract from the character of the area."*

Policy 3.8 Residential 2 (R2) Areas - *Facilitate sustainable infill but only where such development can be provided having regard to any environmental vulnerability, services capacities, and where development can be assimilated satisfactorily through design, layout and amenity impact in a manner that does not detract from*

the character of the area. Ensure assessment of any developments complies with Policy 5.2 is in relation to the protection of sites of European, National, and Local Ecological Importance.

Policy 5.2 Protected Spaces: Sites of European, National and Local Ecological Importance - *1. Protect European sites that form part of the Natura 2000 network (including Special Protection Areas and Special Areas of Conservation) in accordance with the requirements in the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), EU Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) and associated national legislation.*

2. Ensure that all plans or projects within the Plan area will only be authorised and / or supported after the competent authority has ascertained based on scientific evidence, screening for appropriate assessment and /or a Habitats Directive Assessment…

Section 11.3.1 gives the development standards for developments in Outer Suburbs.

Section 11.3.1(c) of the Development Plan specifies the Amenity Open Space provision in residential developments. *Private open space (areas generally not overlooked from a public road) exclusive of car spaces shall be provided at a rate of not less than 50% of the gross floor area of the residential unit.*

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines: Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines 2024

5.2.1. **Density –** Chapter 3, Table 3.2 Area and Density Ranges Limerick, Galway and Waterford City and Suburbs. City, Suburban/Urban Extension - Suburban areas are the low-density car orientated residential areas constructed at the edge of cities in the latter half of the 20th and early 21st century… It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 35 dph to 50 dph (net) shall generally be applied at suburban and urban extension locations in Limerick, Galway and Waterford.

5.2.2. Section 3.3.6 Exception (item c) - In the case of very small infill sites that are not of sufficient scale to define their own character and density, the need to respond to the scale and form of surrounding development, to protect the amenities of surrounding properties and to protect biodiversity may take precedence over the densities set out in this Chapter.

5.2.3. **SPPR 1** - Separation Distances - When considering a planning application for residential development, a separation distance of at least 16 metres between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or side of houses, duplex units and apartment units, above ground floor level shall be maintained. Separation distances below 16 metres may be considered acceptable in circumstances where there are no opposing windows serving habitable rooms and where suitable privacy measures have been designed into the scheme to prevent undue overlooking of habitable rooms and private amenity spaces.

5.3. Ministerial Guidelines: Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines 2007

Table 5.1 of the Guidelines sets the target gross floor area and minimum room sizes required for different dwelling types.

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

5.4.1. The site is located c.925m from Moycullen Bogs NHA (Site Code 002362). European sites Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) is located c.1.3km from the site as well as Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268) and Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004031) are located c.2.7km from the site

6.0 EIA Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a third-party appeal against the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission for the development. The appellant's property is located to the immediate west of subject site, No.8 Cuirt Cheirin and shares a boundary with subject application site. The appeal grounds can be summarised as follows:

- The excessive scale, density, overbearing massing and defective vehicular access arrangement proposed at a highly constrained cul-de-sac turning head.
- Development introduces 2 no. large detached 2 storey dwellings with separate garages and additional driveway opening onto tight cul-de-sac end creating fatal safety issue for turning vehicles.
- Applicant did not submit a DMURs compliance statement or SWEPT path tracking for the development. Has not demonstrated the full impact to turning head manoeuvre for larger vehicles such as refuse trucks and fire engines
- Request permission be refused on traffic hazard overdevelopment and severe injury to residential amenity. If minded granting permission, it is requested that one dwelling is omitted by condition or redesigned to reduce floor area by 30%
- A mandatory 2.5m increase in separation distances from all shared lateral and rear property boundaries and reduction of first floor rear facing elements to eliminate overbearing visual impact and overlooking
- A legally binding CEMP to be agreed with details of contractor parking and delivery arrangement carried outside the cul-de-sac and turning head.
- While national policy promotes compact growth this should be carried out respecting the receiving pattern of development.
- The subdivision of site results in irregular sub-optimal site geometry, narrow setbacks, excessing building scale, plot ratio and height.

- DMURS core principles not addressed in the development – Section 4.1.2 Self-regulating streets, Section 4.3.2 Pedestrian Crossings and Priority, Section 4.3.3 Corner Radii and Swept Path, Section 4.3.4 Pedestrianised and shared surfaces, Section 4.4.1 Carriageway Width and Section 4.4.3 Junction Design. Applicant has not demonstrated that the modified turning head aligns with the DMURS design standards.
- The proposed building heights would result in severe injury to residential amenity and privacy concerns that cannot be overcome by providing obscure glazing for bathroom windows. There are other habitable windows at first floor level resulting in overlooking issues.
- The 2 no. dwellings at the site would result in twice the volume of noise, slamming doors, light pollution, surface water runoffs etc.
- Planning conditions imposed are inadequate to overcome the defects in the layout and concept of proposed developments.
- Development would result in undesirable planning precedent and compromise the integrity of similar suburban estates risking cumulative erosion of suburban character and public road safety.

7.2. Applicant Response

The applicant has provided a response to the third-party appeal. The matters raised can be summarised as follows:

- The issues raised on traffic safety within the cul-de-sac are unsupported as the development does not alter the geometry, width or operational capacity of the cul-de-sac. 10.2m x 2.5m refuse truck manoeuvre has been demonstrated
- The principal bedroom windows are located 11m from the relevant site boundaries and do not provide direct views into neighbouring amenities. First floor openings bathrooms or circulation areas are located 1.8m above floor level.
- The layout has been carefully designed to provide generous private gardens, landscaped courtyards, separation distance and hight standard of residential amenity.

- Landscape strategy includes permanent screening to protect existing and future residents.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

None on file

8.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the report of the local authority made at application stage, 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:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Residential Amenity
- Overbearing, Overlooking and Overshadowing
- Traffic and Road Safety
- Other Matters

8.1. Principle of Development

8.1.1. Land Use Zoning Objective: The application seeks permission for the subdivision of a residential plot and for the construction of 2 no. detached, part 2-storey / part single-storey dwellings. The site is zoned as Residential 2 'R2' areas in the Galway City Council Development Plan 2023-29 with an objective "to provide for sensitive residential infill where such infill will not have an impact on the environmental and visual sensitivities in the area, including those in particular the subject of Policy 5.2 and where such infill can be assimilated satisfactorily through design, layout and amenity impact in a manner that does not detract from the character of the area". The principle of proposed development is considered acceptable under the zoning objective.

8.1.2. Subdivision of site: It is acknowledged that, the subject site was part of a development previously permitted under Reg. Ref. 14/240 for 24 no. detached bungalow dwellings. The site is part of the last few serviced plots within the estate that were never developed. A number of neighbouring dwellings in the estate have been modified in recent years, including alterations to the elevations, material amendments to the floor plan and for the construction of an external garage. The proposed site subdivision of site would result in House No. 1 to have a plot size of 807.3sqm and House No. 2 to have a plot size of 879.7sqm. The subdivision of site is considered acceptable under the R2 zoning which accepts sensitive residential infill development subject to further assessment and the general compliance of the design, and layout with development standards set out in the Development Plan.

8.1.3. Density: The appellant has stated that the development will lead to the erosion of suburban character of the estate. It is noted that the works would result in a marginal increase in the existing residential density, however, the proposed detached dwellings are of similar typology and massing to the permitted dwellings. The addition of one unit is not considered to be significant to alter the suburban character of the site. The density of the site locality remains low – well below 35 dph to 50 dph recommended for sites in suburban areas of Galway as per Table 3.2 of the Compact Settlement Guidelines 2024. This is considered acceptable in this instance given the established low-density setting of the surrounding developments and in order to protect the amenities of surrounding properties.

8.2. Design and Residential Amenity

8.2.1. Floor Area and Height: The proposed 2 no. dwellings have floor areas of 309sqm and 283sqm. The buildings are designed to have single storey and 2-storey elements, with a gable ended façade addressing the cul-de-sac along the front elevation. For House No. 1, the single storey element has a mono pitch roof design at a maximum height of c.4.59m and the two-storey element has a maximum ridge height of c.7.85m. House no. 2 is designed to have a maximum height of 5.57m for the single storey element and a ridge height of c.7.95m for the two-storey element. The parent permission primarily included 1½ storey bungalows with an average height of c.5.9m. However, a number of dwellings in the estate has since then carried out material alterations to the floor plan to include a 2- storey element and

gable fronted elevations. The amended floor plan of No. 6 (under Reg. Ref. 17/268) to the immediate east of subject site has a 2-storey element and gable façade addressing the front elevation with a maximum ridge height of c.7.9m. The proposed ridge height is therefore considered to be acceptable in this instance not necessarily out of character with its surroundings.

8.2.2. Site arrangement and layout: The permitted dwelling, as per the drawings submitted at Further Information Stage, have an L shaped layout with the single storey element and 2-storey elements extending in two directions. Bedrooms are mainly arranged within the upper floor of the two dwellings. The ground floor of the dwelling mainly provides for the living, dining and kitchen areas which are arranged around a central courtyard open space for the dwellings. Private open space provided for each dwelling is above 50% of the gross floor area of the dwellings in alignment with Section 11.3.1(c) of the Development Plan. At ground floor level, the primary openings are designed to address the central courtyard. Secondary openings proposed along the rear and side elevations have restricted width to prevent overlooking issues with adjoining dwellings. Roof overhangs are proposed at the entrance and kitchen/dining spaces. I consider the proposal to provide a high-quality design response for the site.

8.2.3. The appellant has requested that the buildings are provided with a minimum separation distance of at least c.2.5m from all site boundaries. I note that the proposed main dwelling structures would have a setback of at least 3m from all site boundaries. However, the proposed sheds would have a reduced setback from the side boundaries. The suitability of the proposed location of the sheds is considered in detail in the section below. The appellant also requests the omission or significant reduction of first floor elements. As noted above a number of dwellings in the estate includes 2-storey elements. The extend and scale of proposed first floor element will be assessed with regard to possible overshadowing or overlooking impacts onto neighbouring residential amenities. This is carried out in detail in the sections below.

8.2.4. Finishes and boundary treatment: The existing low masonry boundary walls (c.0.8m tall) along the site perimeter are to be retained save for the new vehicular opening (c.3.7m wide) proposed for House No. 2. Each of the dwellings and associated private amenity areas are separated from the hardstanding car parking area proposed within the front section of the sites by means of landscaping features. A

row of columns (c.1.8m tall) is proposed along the front line of the dwelling to provide adequate privacy to the proposed living areas and central open space from the road. The subdivided sites are proposed to be separated by a c.1.2m tall wall which reduces to c.0.8m at the front along the car parking area. It is unclear if the existing site boundaries with No. 6 and No. 8 Cuirt Cheirin are being retained in the proposed development. Finishes for the new separation boundary between House No. 1 and 2 are also unclear from the submitted drawings.

8.2.5. The proposed new dwellings are indicated to have render finishes along primary façades with some brick cladding proposed along ground floor level addressing the central open space. This is considered to be in alignment with the existing arrangement in the estate. However, it is recommended that the colour scheme and proposed materials match existing dwellings in the estate to minimise its visual impact. If permission is considered for the development, it is recommended that a suitably worded condition be included requiring the applicant to agree in writing with the Planning Authority the proposed finishes and boundary treatments.

8.2.6. House no. 1 arrangement: House no. 1 is designed to provide for 5 no. bedrooms, with 1 no. bedroom provided at ground floor level. All the proposed bedrooms exceed the target gross floor area for a four bedroom, 2-storey dwelling house and satisfy the minimum room sizes and width requirements set under the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines 2007. Adequate storage provision is included in the ground floor arrangement as a utility room.

8.2.7. At first floor level, all primary windows for the bedrooms are proposed along the western elevation addressing the central courtyard and would have a separation distance of c.21m from the side façade of adjoining dwelling at no. 8 Cuirt Cheirin. No. 8 Cuirt Cheirin is a 1½ storey bungalow and only has limited openings at first floor level. As the front building line of House No. 1 is set well behind the rear elevation of adjoining dwelling No. 8 Cuirt Cheirin the windows proposed along the side elevations would not have any direct overlooking onto habitable spaces of the adjoining dwelling. Any possible overlooking onto the rear amenity area of No. 8 from the upper floor windows would be partly obstructed by the proposed single storey element of the dwelling.

8.2.8. I note that the elevation drawings provided do not match with the submitted first floor plans. As per the floor plans submitted, there are 5 no. windows proposed along the western elevation and 7no. high level windows along the eastern elevation. However, only 4 no. windows are shown on the western side elevation and the 6no. different scale windows are shown along the eastern side elevation. If permission is considered for the proposed development, it is recommended that accurate elevation drawings corresponding to the floor plans submitted at further information stage are agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.

8.2.9. The 7 no. high-level windows proposed along the eastern elevation would adequately mitigate any possible overlooking between the two new dwellings. 1 no. first floor window is also proposed for the master bedroom along the front gable. This window looks onto the cul-de-sac and would have sufficient separation distance from No. 8. No first-floor windows are proposed along the rear gable end thereby preventing any possible overlooking issues with dwellings to the rear. Having regard to the foregoing, I do not consider the proposed development to result in any undue overlooking issues onto neighbouring residential developments.

8.2.10. House no. 2 arrangement: House No. 2 is designed to have 4 no. bedrooms at first floor level. All the bedrooms satisfy the minimum floor area and width requirements as per the Quality Housing for Sustainable Communities, Best Practice Guidelines 2007. Adequate storage and living areas are also provided at ground floor level. The primary windows for the proposed bedrooms at first floor level are provided along the western elevation of House No. 2, they open onto the central courtyard and will have a separation distance of 15m from the 2-storey element of House No.1 . As discussed previously, the eastern elevation of House No. 1 only includes high-level windows at first floor level, and these are angled away from the first-floor level of House No. 2. The reduced separation distance is considered acceptable in this instance as there are no directly opposing windows serving habitable rooms in House No. 1.

8.2.11. Similar to House No. 1, only high-level windows are proposed along the eastern elevation where they address neighbouring dwelling No. 6 Cuirt Cheirin. 1 no. first floor window is proposed along front gable end. This is unlikely to result in any undue overlooking issues as the window directly looks onto the cul-de-sac. There are no directly opposing first floor windows along the side elevation of No. 6 Cuirt Cheirin.

The design has therefore considered any likely overlooking issues with adjoining existing and proposed residential units. No overlooking issues are envisaged with dwellings to the rear as there are no first-floor windows proposed along the rear gable end of House No. 2.

8.2.12. As standard practice, it is recommended that a condition be included requesting all bathroom windows to be fitted with permanent obscure glazing. It is noted that like House No. 1, the elevations submitted for House No.2 does not accurately portray the window arrangements indicated in the first-floor plan. If permission is considered for the proposed development, it is recommended that the applicant be requested to submit revised elevation drawings corresponding to the floor plans for the written agreement of the Planning Authority.

8.2.13. Sheds: An 18sqm shed is also proposed for each of the dwelling. The sheds proposed at initial application stage, included a rectangular shape and a mono pitch roof at a parapet height of c.3.0m. At Further Information stage, the Planning Authority requested relocation of sheds so as to allow for an increased separation distance with site boundaries. The revised proposal submitted as FI response relocated the sheds to the side of the proposed dwelling and was considered acceptable by the Planning Authority. The new sheds have an irregular footprint and a mono-pitch roof at a maximum height of c.3.4m. Within the revised arrangement, the proposed sheds would have a setback of approximately c.3m from the rear site boundary shared with dwellings to the north at The Heath. Although the new shed locations are closer to the eastern boundaries, the structures are unlikely to result in any overshadowing onto adjoining dwellings given their location at the northeastern corner of the site. No windows are proposed along the eastern side elevation of the sheds where they address the adjoining dwelling. The sheds are well setback from the road corridor and therefore are unlikely to have any significant visual impact along the street elevation. The revised location and design of the sheds are therefore considered acceptable.

8.3. Overbearing, Overlooking and Overshadowing

8.3.1. The appellants have raised concerns with regard to the proposed scale of dwellings and the 2-storey element of the design. The height and scale of the dwellings are generally in line with the existing dwellings in the estate. Although the design scheme proposed is slightly different from the adjoining dwellings, I note that there are a variety of design styles in the estate and some of the dwellings have undergone recent alterations to include first floor elements and gable ends along the front elevation. I therefore do not consider the proposed design to be incompatible with the established setting of the estate or likely to result in negative impact to visual or residential amenities.

8.3.2. As assessed in the previous sections, the design of the dwellings respects the privacy and residential amenities of adjoining dwellings. Given the distance between proposed and existing dwellings, the buildings are unlikely to result in any significant overshadowing issues onto neighbouring dwellings. As discussed above, overlooking issues have been mitigated and minimised in the proposed design scheme. I therefore do not consider the design to result in any undue overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing impacts for adjoining residential dwellings.

8.4. Traffic and Road Safety

8.4.1. The appellants have raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposed subdivision and new vehicular access onto the existing road network particularly, with regard to impact to the turning area of the existing cul-de-sac, access for emergency vehicles and increased traffic. The existing cul-de-sac has a very spacious arrangement with a c. 9m radius turning head and is connected onto an internal road c.6m wide. The applicant has submitted an additional drawing in their appeal response showing the reverse manoeuvre for an emergency vehicle or refuse truck 10.2m x2.5m. Although a new opening is being proposed onto the cul-de-sac in the development, the operational arrangement and geometry of the turning head is not impacted by the proposal.

8.4.2. The original layout for this estate accommodated one detached dwelling. The addition of 1 no. dwelling would to some extent result in some additional traffic. However, this section of the internal road serving subject site only provides access to

a limited number of dwellings. Therefore, I am satisfied that there is adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Any likely impacts from the proposed development would be largely imperceptible and is unlikely to result in traffic safety issues.

8.4.3. It is noted that, the Planning Authority imposed Condition No 13 in the subject permission requiring dropped kerbs to be provided along the proposed vehicular entrances and footpaths to be reconstructed. However, there are currently no footpaths along the front boundary of the site, and it is not clear whether the parent permission included provisions for footpath here. There is an existing footpath running along the eastern side of the internal access road which terminates at the entrance to No. 6 Cuirt Cheirin. The subject site includes ample space for the provision of pedestrian facilities along the front site boundary. However, to achieve connectivity with the existing footpath network in the estate, works would have to be carried out outside the site boundaries and applicants' ownership. Given the lack of footpath connectivity in the estate, the provision of footpath for this section of the site is unlikely to significantly improve pedestrian connectivity or safety for the site locality. Therefore, in this instance, I do not see any significant merit in requesting the applicant to provide a section of footpath along the front boundary, within the site curtilage. Sufficient space is available within the cul-de-sac, outside the application site to provide for footpath by the roads authority if deemed appropriate or necessary in the future.

8.4.4. The appellant has also stated that the proposal does not address DMURS core principles. DMURS Audit would be applicable for new residential development in urban areas and particularly with regard to proposals which impacts the design of roads and streets. The subject application is reliant on an existing street arrangement and does not propose to alter the geometry of the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, the proposed parking area to the front of the dwelling would allow for turning of vehicles within the site curtilage and therefore would not require any vehicles to reverse out onto the cul-de-sac. I therefore do not consider the proposed new entrance to result in any traffic/pedestrian safety issues at the cul-de-sac.

8.5. Other Matters

8.5.1. CEMP and construction noise: It is understood that the works could result in construction noise and dust impacts to adjoining residential dwellings, however, the impacts are likely to be very similar to the permitted development of 1 no. dwelling at this site and would be temporary in nature. The appellant has requested the construction works to be agreed by means of a legally binding CEMP and that contractor parking and deliveries be carried outside the turning head. Given the proximity of the site to other residential dwellings, I consider this request to be reasonable. If permission is considered for the proposed development, it is recommended that a suitably worded condition be included to agree construction management details with the Planning Authority and requesting the construction site compound and contractor parking be carried out within the site boundary.

8.6. Conclusion

8.6.1. Having considered the design of the proposed dwellings, their scale, massing, height, and separation distance with neighbouring dwellings, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in significant overbearance, overlooking or overshadowing issues onto adjoining residential amenities. The design proposal respects the existing low-density residential setting of the area and is considered to provide a high-quality design response for the site. It is recommended that permission be granted for the proposed development subject to conditions agreeing finishes, boundary treatment and construction management measures.

9.0 AA Screening

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

9.2. The subject site is not located within a designated site. The site is located c.1.3km from Lough Corrib SAC (Site Code 000297) and is located c.2.7km of Galway Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 000268) and Inner Galway Bay SPA (Site Code 004031).

9.3. 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.

9.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Scale and size of the proposed development within an existing urban setting.
- The lack of connections to the SAC.
- Connection to public water, drain and sewer.

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. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. An assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken with regard to the objectives set out in Article 4 of the EU Water Framework Directive.

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. In addition, the proposed development will not adversely affect the achievement of established environmental objectives, including the protection, maintenance, and improvement of water body status, as required under the Directive.

10.4. 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 for the following reasons and considerations set out below.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the subject site location within the outer suburbs of Galway City, on residential zoned and serviced lands, the proposed subdivision of site is considered acceptable as it would allow for the efficient utilisation of serviced lands, in compliance with the land use zoning objective for R2 - Residential 2 zoned lands within the Galway City Development Plan 2023-29. The proposed scale, height and layout of dwellings is not considered to result in undue visual impact, overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing effects and is unlikely to result in any traffic/pedestrian safety issues for the existing road network. The proposed development, subject to compliance with conditions set out below, would 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 28 May 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. Revised elevation drawings showing the actual extent, position and number of proposed fenestrations along the eastern and western elevations of both dwellings for the written agreement of the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

   Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

3. The external finishes of the proposed extension (including roof tiles/slates) shall harmonise with those of the existing dwelling in respect of colour and texture. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes and boundary treatment to the proposed buildings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

   Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

4. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements, in writing where necessary, of the planning authority for such works and services.

   Reason: In the interest of public health.

5. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreement (s) with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for a service connection(s) to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network.

   Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.

6. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0900 to 1300 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

   Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

7. Prior to commencement of works, the developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with the planning authority, a Construction Management Plan, which shall be adhered to during construction. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise and dust management measures and off-site disposal of construction/demolition waste. Construction compound and contractor parking shall be carried out within the site boundaries.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and amenity.

8. All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

   Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

9. The glazing to all bathroom and en-suite windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.

   Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

10. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall lodge with the planning authority a cash deposit, a bond of an insurance company, or such other security as may be acceptable to the planning authority, to secure the reinstatement of public roads which may be damaged by the transport of materials to the site, coupled with an agreement empowering the planning authority to apply such security or part thereof to the satisfactory reinstatement of the public road. The form and amount of the security shall be as agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of agreement, shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála for determination.

    Reason: To ensure that the public road is satisfactorily reinstated, if necessary.

11. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer, or,

in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Coimisiún Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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

Sandra Eapen
Planning Inspector

07 October 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-501616-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Subdivision of suburban undeveloped site and for the development of 2 no. detached dwellings on site.
Development Address	**No. 7 Cuirt Cheirin, Galway, Galway County**
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	☐ No, No further action required.
(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	

2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified **in Part 1.** **EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.**	**State the Class here**
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. **No Screening required.**	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. **EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required**	**State the Class and state the relevant threshold**
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	**Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) Infrastructure projects, construction of more than 500 dwelling units**

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 ☐	**Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)**
No ☒	**Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)**

Inspector: Sandra Eapen **Date: 07 October 2026**

Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	PL-501616-GC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Subdivision of suburban undeveloped site and for the development of 2 no. detached dwellings on site.
Development Address	No. 7 Cuirt Cheirin
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	**Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.** The proposed development has a total footprint of c.628sqm, is a standalone project that does not require any demolition works, or substantial natural resources that could give rise to significant pollution or nuisance. The development by virtue of its type, scale and location does not pose a risk of major accident or disaster nor is it vulnerable to climate change. The proposed development does not present any risk to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites,	**Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed** The proposed development site is located within a suburban setting and consist of c.0.16ha of undeveloped serviced lands. The site is removed from any sensitive natural habitats and designated sites and landscapes of significance identified in the Galway City Development Plan 2023-29

densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	**Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.** Having regard to the scale and nature of proposed development, its location removed from any sensitive habitats or features, likely magnitude and spatial extent of effects and the absence of any likely in-combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	**Conclusion in respect of EIA**
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	**EIA is not required.**

+

Inspector: Sandra Eapen Date:07 October 2026