



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-310827-21

### Development

Permission for retention of

A – Deposited broken rock and spoil material at shoreline for use in rock armour retaining wall,

B – Vehicular entrance/exit from field, and

C – 2 pillars and gate adjoining County road L-4922-64.

Permission for

D – Removal of entire sod and stone fence adjoining County road L-4922-64,

E – Construction of natural stone wall adjoining County road L-4922-64, and

F – Construction of rock armour retaining wall with concrete boat slipway and outer face set to high watermark, and

All associated site works.

### Location

Rerrin, Bere Island, Beara, Co. Cork

<b>Planning Authority</b>	Cork County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	21/261
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Tony & Nora Hall
<b>Type of Application</b>	Retention permission and permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Split-decision
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First Party -v- Decision
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Tony & Nora Hall
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> October 2021
<b>Inspector</b>	Hugh D. Morrison

## Contents

2.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
3.0 Proposed Development .....	4
4.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
4.1. Decision .....	5
4.2. Planning Authority Reports .....	6
5.0 Planning History.....	6
6.0 Policy and Context.....	7
6.1. Development Plan.....	7
6.2. Natural Heritage Designations .....	8
6.3. EIA Screening .....	8
7.0 The Appeal .....	9
7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	9
7.2. Planning Authority Response .....	10
7.3. Observations .....	11
7.4. Further Responses.....	11
8.0 Assessment.....	11
9.0 Recommendation.....	18
10.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	19

## 2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The site is located on the western side of Rerrin, which is a small settlement in the eastern portion of Bear Island. To the north of this site lies Lawrence's Cove, within which is situated a pier that serves one of the ferry services to the Island. The site is accessed from the L-4922-64 and the applicants own the dwelling house on the opposite side of the local road from it. To the east lies a bungalow and to the west, at a short remove, lies another dwelling house.
- 2.2. The site itself is of elongated form, which stretches on a roughly north-east/south-west axis, and it has an area of 0.12 hectares. This site extends from the local high-water line of Lawrence's Cove across a grassy area of land to encompass that portion of the local road which adjoins the main body of the site. The north-western boundary is denoted by an embankment, which rises above the high-water line at moderate to steep gradients, and the south-eastern boundary to the main body of the site is denoted by a sod and stone mound. A small boat house is sited adjacent to the north-eastern boundary along with a gated access from the local road. The south-western boundary is denoted by a painted concrete post and rail fence.

## 3.0 Proposed Development

- 3.1. The proposal comprises items for retention and items for proposed future development. These have been delineated in the applicants' description as follows:
- For retention:
    - A – Deposited broken rock and spoil material at shoreline for use in rock armour retaining wall,
    - B – Vehicular entrance/exit from field, and
    - C – 2 pillars and gate adjoining County road L-4922-64.
  - For future development:
    - D – Removal of entire sod and stone fence adjoining County road L-4922-64,
    - E – Construction of natural stone wall adjoining County road L-4922-64, and
    - F – Construction of rock armour retaining wall with concrete boat slipway and outer face set to high watermark.

## 4.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 4.1. Decision

The Planning Authority granted retention permission to items B and C and permission to items D and E, subject to 12 conditions, one of which Condition No. 3 is set out below for ease of reference:

*With the single exception of the boat house (PL04.244561) no other structure, object or thing shall be placed on the lands edged red on the plans received by the Planning Authority on 23/04/2021 unless a further permission is obtained from the Planning Authority the use of the land shall remain that of "agriculture" as defined by Section 2(1) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as may be amended, which states as follows: "Agriculture" includes horticulture, fruit growing, seed growing, dairy farming, the breeding and keeping of livestock (including any creature kept for the production of food, wool, skins, fur, or for the purpose of its use in the farming of land), the training of horses and the rearing of bloodstock, the use of land as grazing land, meadow land, osier land, market gardens and nursery grounds and "agricultural".*

The accompanying reason states: "In the interests of amenity and the proper sustainable planning for the area."

The Planning Authority refused retention permission for item A and refused permission for item F for the following reason:

*As stated in the Cork County Development Plan 2014, it is the Council's stated policy, under Objective GI 6-1 to protect the visual and scenic amenities of the natural environment of Cork County in line with the principle of sustainability and under Objective TO 4-1 to develop the marine leisure sector in a coherent and sustainable manner and in a sensitive manner along the coastline.*

*The retention of the unauthorised visually distressing tipped rock material and the proposed rock armour is incompatible with such objectives for which there is reasoned justification, including matters of coastal erosion, resulting in an unacceptable change to the natural coastline and inappropriate development with the introduction of harsh, hard unsustainable man-made structures that, if permitted, would create a wholly unacceptable precedent for other such similar works along the unspoilt coastline.*

*Accordingly, the development to be retained and the development proposed would seriously injure the amenities of this designated "High Value Landscape" which the site is*

*contained within, would interfere with the character of the landscape, and would contravene materially stated objectives as set out in the Cork County Development Plan 2014 that would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

## 4.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 4.2.1. Planning Reports

See decision.

### 4.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Cork County Council
  - Estates: No objection – Proposals acceptable from a flood risk perspective.
  - Ecology: Further information requested:
    - Justification for the proposed rock armouring,
    - An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), and
    - A construction Method Statement.
  - Area Engineer: No objection – Conditions requested.

## 5.0 Planning History

The land in the applicants' ownership has an extensive planning history, which is set out in the case planner's report. The site, as distinct from the wider landholding, has the following planning history:

- 14/00703: Amongst other things, construction of a new single storey domestic boathouse to replace an existing 20-foot shipping container, which is to be removed: Permitted at appeal PL04.244561.
- SKB160033: Enforcement enquiry re. alleged formation of an entrance and erection of stone pillars on lands to the north of the L-4922-64: Warning letter was issued on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016. (This entrance is situated towards the centre of the site's roadside frontage and it is the subject of the current application).

- D/14/19: Section 5 application re. removal of existing roadside sod and stone ditch wall and construction of a new natural stone wall 1.2m in height: Declaration – Works would be development, which is not exempted development.
- 19/537: Similar proposal to the current one: Invalidated.
- SKB190035: Enforcement enquiry re. alleged formation of an entrance, the importation and deposition of rock and spoil material and a northerly extension and a material change of use of lands at the foreshore: Warning letter issued on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2019. (This entrance lies at the western end of the site's roadside frontage and it is described on the submitted plans as being temporary for the construction period of the proposal only).

## 6.0 Policy and Context

### 6.1. Development Plan

The operative statutory plans for Bear Island are the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020 (CDP) and the West Cork Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (LAP).

Under the CDP, the landscape character type of Bear Island is Rugged Ridge Peninsulas, the value and sensitivity of which are deemed to be very high and the importance of which is deemed to be national.

Objective GI 6-1 addresses landscape as follows:

- a) Protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork's built and natural environment.*
- b) Landscape issues will be an important factor in all land-use proposals, ensuring that a proactive view of development is undertaken while maintaining respect for the environment and heritage generally in line with the principle of sustainability.*
- c) Ensure that new development meets high standards of siting and design.*
- d) Protect skylines and ridgelines from development.*
- e) Discourage proposals necessitating the removal of extensive amounts of trees, hedgerows and historic walls or other distinctive boundary treatments.*

Objective GI 6-2 addresses the Draft Landscape Strategy as follows:

*Ensure that the management of development throughout the County will have regard for the value of the landscape, its character, distinctiveness and sensitivity as recognised in the Cork County Draft Landscape Strategy and its recommendations, in order to minimize the visual and environmental impact of development, particularly in areas designated as High Value Landscapes where higher development standards (layout, design, landscaping, materials used) will be required.*

Objective TO 4-1 addresses developing the marine leisure sector as follows:

*a) Develop the marine leisure sector in the County in a coherent and sustainable manner making the best use of existing and planned infrastructure and resources, in a manner that is sensitive to the natural and cultural heritage resources of our coastal zone, and complies with relevant environmental legislation including the Habitats, Birds, Water Framework, Floods, SEA and EIA Directives.*

*b) Support the development of sustainable recreation and activity related marine tourism developments at appropriate locations along the coastline and in the vicinity of the inland waterways and lakes where these are compatible with the environmental and heritage sensitivities of identified sites.*

## **6.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

Beara Peninsula SPA (004155)

## **6.3. EIA Screening**

Item 10(k) of Part 2 of Schedule 5 to Article 93 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 – 2021, addresses the need for a mandatory EIA where the following development would arise:

*Coastal work to combat erosion and maritime works capable of altering the coast through the construction, for example, of dikes, moles, jetties and other sea defence works, where the length of coastline on which works would take place would exceed 1 kilometre, but excluding the maintenance and reconstruction of such works or works required for emergency purposes.*

The proposal is essentially for the construction of a rock armour retaining wall with a concrete boat slipway over c. 75m of coastline. Accordingly, it does not attract the need for a mandatory EIA. Furthermore, as this proposal would fall below the



relevant threshold of 1km, I conclude that, based on its nature, size, and location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects upon the environment and so the preparation of an EIAR is not required.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

The applicants begin by describing their property and reviewing its planning history. They state that the boat house is in use for the storage of dinghies and canoes, and they provide a commentary on the planning history from their perspective. The applicants proceed to cite the following grounds of appeal:

- The proposal would not adversely impact upon the visual and scenic amenities of the area. At the appeal stage, this proposal has been modified to show a narrower slipway, at 1.5m rather than 2.5m, and shorter platforms at the top and at the bottom of this slipway. The top 1m of the sea wall would be formed by gabions infilled with soil, rather than rock armour. These gabions would be expected to be populated by native species.
- The applicants apologise for the tipping of c. 40 cubic metres of rock fill along the shore, which occurred when a contractor, knowing that a Section 5 application had been made, acted prematurely.
- The site is narrow, and it is being diminished. Accordingly, under the proposal, the applicants wish to restore and protect it. The envisaged works would be undertaken on the applicants' property rather than on the shoreline, although this property has experienced some sea water incursion. While the County Ecologist requested an EclA, the Planning Authority did not ask for further information. The applicants would be prepared at the appeal stage to prepare/submit an EclA if requested to do so by the Board.
- The Area Engineer raised no objection.
- The Estates Engineer raised no objection, and he confirmed that the proposal would be acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

The objector to the proposal resides to the east of the site in a property that benefits from rock armour walls on the foreshore, which have not been softened by vegetation.

The applicants make the following points under their conclusion:

- They have restored their present dwelling house, the Old School House, to a high standard.
- They have subsequently undertaken works to an outbuilding within the curtilage to their dwelling house. Associated planning controversy has now been resolved.
- They have constructed a boat house and now wish to undertake further works on the subject site, by way of a roadside wall and a retaining wall above the shoreline. These works have reignited planning controversy, which has blighted their enjoyment of their property.
- They state that the use of the site following the proposed works would be simply for uses ancillary to the enjoyment of their dwelling house. The need for the slipway arises from the fact that they are no longer able to scale the embankment with canoes.
- They state that the proposed works would be undertaken from within the site and so plant and machinery would not need to operate from the foreshore.
- They state that the site lies within the settlement of Rerrin, and so, within this context, it would not be unusual for man-made structures to be present.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

The Planning Authority stands by its decision and the supporting case for it set out in the case planner's report. Several points are nevertheless made.

- The tipping of rock represents the continuation of a pattern of unauthorised development that the applicants have subsequently sought to regularise retrospectively.

- Bear Island exhibits other examples of unauthorised development, which having not been addressed, have prompted still further unauthorised development.
- Coastal erosion of Bear Island is not a serious phenomenon and the applicants have not demonstrated that such erosion is occurring in the case of their site, which is highly visible to those arriving/departing by ferry at the nearby pier.
- The impetus for the proposal would appear to be the quest to use the site for domestic purposes in conjunction with the applicants' adjacent dwelling house.
- There is a distinct risk that the proposal, if granted, would establish an adverse precedent for similar development in the future.

### 7.3. **Observations**

None

### 7.4. **Further Responses**

None

## 8.0 **Assessment**

- 8.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020 (CDP), the West Cork Municipal District Local Area Plan 2017 (LAP), relevant planning history, and the submissions of the parties. Accordingly, I consider that the current application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:
- (i) Land use, hydrology, and ecology,
  - (ii) Landscape and visual impacts, and
  - (iii) Appropriate Assessment.

**(i) Land use, hydrology, and ecology**

- 8.2. The LAP does not define the settlement of Rerrin by means of a boundary or zoning. During my site visit, I observed that it exhibits a scattered pattern wherein dwelling houses and their gardens are interspersed with hedgerows and fields. I also observed that the sign for Rerrin on the local road is sited in a position adjacent to the south-western corner of the site and so the site “reads” as being within the identified settlement.
- 8.3. At present, the main body of the site is a small, overgrown, grassy field, with a sod and stone mound along its roadside boundary. Apart from the siting of the boat house at the north-eastern end of the site, its character and appearance are consistent with an historic agricultural use.
- 8.4. The submitted application forms indicate that the proposed works would improve the applicants’ enjoyment of their property. At the appeal stage, the applicants elucidated this statement, in response to the perceived concerns of the Planning Authority over the future usage of the site, by stating that it would be the subject of uses ancillary to the enjoyment of their dwelling house, which lies immediately to the north of the site. This description of future usage would be consistent with the incorporation of the site within the curtilage of the dwelling house and thus its material change of use from what I am assuming is still agricultural use to presumably domestic garden use.
- 8.5. Under Items B, C, D & E, the existing stone pillars and pair of ornate gates, which are sited towards the centre of the site’s roadside frontage would be retained and the existing sod and stone mound to this frontage would be replaced by a stone wall. The pillars and gates correspond with the pillars and gates on the opposite side of the local road, which serve the grounds to the applicants’ dwelling house. The proposed wall would, likewise, correspond with the existing roadside wall to these grounds.
- 8.6. The description of the proposal cites Items B, C, D & E which would be consistent with the above change of use and yet this description does not address the underlying question of usage. The case planner in his report shares my understanding of the site’s last and now envisaged use. The Planning Authority in granting retention permission/permission for the above cited Items attached

Condition No. 3, which requires that any future structure, object or thing placed on the site should be the subject of planning permission. It also appears to require that the use of the site remain that of agriculture.

- 8.7. *Prima facie* there appears to be a contradiction here: Items B, C, D & E would signal/facilitate a domestic use of the site and yet Condition No. 3 requires that it remain in agricultural use. In these circumstances, I consider that the description of the proposal needs to address explicitly the future usage of the site. Based on a clear understanding of such usage, the appropriateness or otherwise of these Items could be assessed/determined.
- 8.8. Under Item F, a concrete boat slipway is proposed, which would serve the existing boat house on the site, which was permitted by the Board under PL04.244561. The inspector's report on this case touches on the apparent anomaly of a boat house without a slipway. The applicants in 2014 stated that they had no plans to construct a slipway and the inspector commented that "The situation on the ground is that a rough overgrown bank leads down to a seaweed covered foreshore which, in turn leads to the water. If the intention is indeed to store kayaks, the likely reality is that these would be manhandled down to the sea and no slipway would be necessary." The applicants now state that they are no longer able to scale the embankment with canoes and so the need for a slipway arises.
- 8.9. The submitted plans make clear that the proposed slipway would be constructed in conjunction with the proposed rock armour retaining wall. At the appeal stage, revised plans of both these elements were submitted. They show a more modest slipway and the use of rock armour in the lower reaches of the wall with soil filled gabion baskets in the upper reaches.
- 8.10. The applicants state in the cover letter to their application that the site has been eroded by the sea over the years. Such erosion provides the impetus for their proposal to construct a rock armour retaining wall, which would abut the high-water line as defined by the Ordnance Survey.
- 8.11. The Planning Authority questions whether coastal erosion is occurring. During my site visit, I observed the embankment to the site, which abuts the shoreline. Some of this embankment has been disturbed by the tipping of rocks. Where it has not been disturbed, vegetation grows down its slopes in a manner that does not suggest the

occurrence of erosion by the sea. In these circumstances, I consider that there is an onus upon the applicants to substantiate their contention that coastal erosion is occurring. This they have yet to do.

- 8.12. The County Ecologist requested that the application be the subject of a request for further information. He prefaced his request by stating that he is not in favour of interfering with natural dynamic coastal processes and that any interventions in these processes, such as the proposed rock armour retaining wall, would require strong justification. The case planner also cites the draft CDP, which, under Objective MCI 7-4(b), states “Employ soft engineering techniques as an alternative to hard coastal defence works wherever possible.” I, therefore, consider that the applicants not only need to demonstrate that the site is at risk of coastal erosion, but they need to justify their proposed reliance upon a man-made structure instead of soft engineering, which uses ecological principles/practices that support natural processes.
- 8.13. The requested further information would have entailed the submission of an EclA and a Construction Method Statement. In relation to the former, the County Ecologist advised that “Installation of rock armouring in coastal areas can result in an alteration of natural erosional and depositional patterns along the coastline, which can have negative implications from an ecological and/or hydro-morphological perspective. Consideration of these impacts needs to be incorporated into the EclA and may need input from an engineer with expertise in coastal erosion/coastal dynamics.” The applicants have stated that they are willing to submit an EclA, if requested to do so by the Board. In relation to the latter, they have stated that the envisaged works would be capable of being carried out without the need for plant and machinery to operate from the foreshore.
- 8.14. I consider that an EclA is needed and that a Construction Method Statement would afford the applicants the opportunity to demonstrate that the foreshore would not be encroached upon.
- 8.15. I conclude that the description of the application omits to address the implicit change of use in the proposal and that this omission has led to the Planning Authority issuing a conflicted permission. A clear statement of usage in this description is therefore necessary. I conclude, too, that in the absence of any through-going justification for

the rock armour retaining wall, an EclA, and a Construction Method Statement, a full assessment of the proposal is not possible. In these circumstances, it would be premature to grant retention permission/permission.

## **(ii) Landscape and visual impacts**

- 8.16. Under the CDP, the whole of Bear Island is shown as lying with the landscape character type known as Rugged Ridge Peninsulas. This landscape is deemed to be of very high value and sensitivity and of national importance.
- 8.17. The site lies within the identified settlement of Rerrin, in a position between the local road and the shoreline to Lawrence's Cove. The pier which serves this settlement lies to the north of the site and the shoreline in question bounds the inner most portion of the Cove. From this pier, the site is seen in conjunction with the bungalow to its north-east, which has an accompanying rock armour/concrete retaining wall with the foreshore, the applicants' dwelling house to the south, and a two-storey dwelling house at a short remove to the south-west, which has accompanying graded embankments with the foreshore. Further to the north-east is the centre of Rerrin and further to the south-west the local road is treelined as it passes through open countryside.
- 8.18. As described under the first heading of my assessment, Items B, C, D & E would pertain to the roadside boundary of the site and Items A & F would pertain to the shoreside boundary. The former Items would change the character and appearance of the roadside boundary so that instead of being a traditional field boundary it would replicate the boundary treatment to the grounds of the applicants' dwelling house on the opposite side of the local road. Visually, this boundary would invite a comparison with the corresponding existing one and so it would "read" as a domestic rather than an agricultural boundary. The latter Items would change the character and appearance of the shoreside boundary from that of a sloping embankment with vegetation to that of a vertical retaining wall with vegetation in its upper reaches and an accompanying concrete slipway. Visually, this boundary would "read" as largely a man-made intervention rather than a natural embankment.
- 8.19. Within the context of the site, which lies within Rerrin, the applicant states that man-made structures would not be unexpected. While I acknowledge the validity of this

statement, the following considerations are inextricably linked to any assessment of the proposal from landscape and visual perspectives:

- The appropriateness or otherwise of the proposed roadside boundary turns on clarity over the future use of the site. If, as seems likely, this use would be as a garden area to serve the applicants' existing dwelling house, then a view needs to be taken as to the appropriateness of having a "freestanding" garden beyond the applicants' existing garden area that surrounds their dwelling house. Given that the character and appearance of Rerrin is contributed to by the existing interspersion of dwelling houses and their gardens on the one hand and fields on the other hand, the precedent of permitting a "freestanding" garden would need to be carefully weighed.
- The appropriateness or otherwise of the proposed shoreside boundary turns on whether this treatment can be justified in terms of hydrology and ecology. As discussed under the first heading of my assessment, these matters have yet to be addressed by the applicants.

8.20. I conclude that the proposal would lead to the substitution of existing traditional/natural boundary treatments to the site by proposed man-made structures. While such structures would not be wholly unexpected within Rerrin from landscape and visual perspectives, the justification for Items B, C, D & E would rest on clarity over the future use of the site and the appropriateness of this use within the context of the settlement, and the justification for Items A & F would rest on the conclusion that they would be the most appropriate treatment from hydrological and ecological perspectives.

### **(iii) Appropriate Assessment**

8.21. The site lies 600m to the north of the Beara Peninsula SPA (004155). While the applicants did not submit a Stage 1 screening report, the case planner undertook an initial screening exercise, which concluded that it could only be completed with the submission of an EclA. The issue arising relates to the potential for negative impacts or uncertainty with respect to such impacts.

8.22. I will undertake a Stage 1 screening, which seeks to answer the question "Is the project likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans and projects on a European Site(s)."



#### Step 1

- 8.23. The project would entail the replacement of the existing sod and stone mound to the site's roadside boundary with a stone wall, which would incorporate an unauthorised site entrance within it, and the construction of essentially a rock armour retaining wall along the shoreside boundary, along with a slipway to serve an existing boat house.

#### Step 2

- 8.24. The site lies 600m away from the Beara Peninsula SPA (004155). Other European sites lie either to the south of Bantry Bay or to the west and north of the Kenmare River Estuary and so at too great a distance to be affected by the proposal.

#### Step 3

- 8.25. The Qualifying Interests/Special Conservation Interests of the Beara Peninsula SPA are the Fulmar and the Chough and the Conservation Objective for this SPA is to maintain or restore their favourable conservation condition.

#### Step 4

- 8.26. The site synopsis states that it supports a nationally important population of Fulmar and it is one of the most important sites in the country for Chough. This synopsis gives a breakdown in the known populations of Chough. While Bear Island is not cited in this respect, the breakdown is based on older survey work. New survey work commissioned by the Department of the Environment, Local Government and Heritage for this year will yield an up-to-date picture of distribution.

- 8.27. The qualifying species exhibit the following practises:

- The Fulmar nests in cliffs and forages at sea, and
- The Chough nests in cliffs and old buildings and forages on adjoining grasslands, typically within c. 300m of its nests.

- 8.28. Under the proposal, uncertainty pertains to the future use of the site, although the likelihood is that its present overgrown grassy state would cease. In the absence of an EclA, uncertainty also pertains to the impact that it would have upon the foreshore as a habitat and upon the species therein.

- 8.29. Given the nesting and foraging patterns of the qualifying interests, they may not rely upon the site to any appreciable extent. However, the degree of uncertainty

surrounding the future use and ecological impacts of the proposal is such that I am not able to conclude that it would have no indirect effects upon them.

#### Step 5

- 8.30. I am not aware of any other projects that could in combination with the currently proposed one give rise to likely significant effects upon the Beara Peninsula SPA.

#### Step 6

- 8.31. In the light of my discussion under Step 4, in the absence of best available scientific information on the site, which would normally be presented in a Stage 1 Screening prepared by an ecologist on behalf of the applicant and potentially in a Natura Impact Statement, should one be needed, I am not in a position to determine whether the project could undermine the conservation objective of the Beara Peninsula SPA and give rise to significant effects.
- 8.32. I conclude that there is insufficient information before me to complete a Stage 1 Screening of the project.

## 9.0 Recommendation

That permission be refused.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. It is considered that insufficient information has been submitted with the application and appeal to establish the following:
  - What the proposed use of the site would be,
  - Whether the site is the subject of coastal erosion,
  - What the hydrological and ecological impacts would be of the proposed rock armour wall, and
  - In the presence of demonstrable coastal erosion and in the light of the identified hydrological and ecological impacts, whether the proposed rock armour wall would be the most appropriate response to coastal erosion from hydrological and ecological perspectives.

In the absence of the foregoing information, and having regard to Objectives TO 4-1 and GI 6-1 of the Cork County Development Plan 2014 – 2020, it is considered that to grant permission to the proposal would be premature, as it would risk harming the ecology of the shoreline and the introduction of inordinate man-made interventions to what is a very high value landscape, with a consequent unjustifiable impact upon the visual amenities of the area. The proposal, as submitted, would thus fail to accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application and appeal to enable the Board to carry out a Stage 1 screening of the project for the purpose of Appropriate Assessment. Consequently, the Board cannot be satisfied that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect either individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on European site No. 004155, in view of the Site's Conservation Objective. In such circumstances, the Board is precluded from granting approval/permission.

---

Hugh D. Morrison  
Planning Inspector

1<sup>st</sup> November 2021