



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-311754-21

---

<b>Development</b>	Demolition of existing milking parlour, construction of milking parlour, dairy & ancillary rooms, agricultural livestock shed, silage pit and all other associated site works
<b>Location</b>	Gibbonstown, Kilmallock, Co. Limerick
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Limerick City and County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	21503
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Thomas & Geraldine O'Connor Limited
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant with conditions
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Noel Halpin
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2021
<b>Inspector</b>	Liam Bowe

# Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	3
3.1. Request for Further Information .....	3
3.2. Decision .....	4
3.3. Planning Authority Reports .....	4
3.4. Prescribed Bodies .....	5
3.5. Third Party Observations .....	5
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Limerick County Development Plan 2010-2016 (as extended) .....	5
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations .....	6
5.4. EIA Screening .....	7
6.0 The Appeal .....	7
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
6.2. Applicant Response .....	8
6.3. Planning Authority Response .....	9
7.0 Assessment.....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	17
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	17
10.0 Conditions .....	18

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 1.58ha appeal site is situated approximately 3km northeast of Kilmallock in County Limerick. The site is located in the centre of a landholding stated as approximately 146ha. It is located approximately 400m east of the local road. The closest dwelling is applicants' farmhouse located 100m northwest of the main body of the site and there is a dwelling opposite the southwestern access to the farmyard, which is approx. 400m from the appeal site. The rural area is sparsely populated and is predominately in agriculture use.
- 1.2. The appeal site contains an existing milking parlour and associated hardstanding and there is an existing farmyard complex, adjacent to the farmhouse on the landholding, that is located 100m northwest of the appeal site. Farm access tracks run throughout the landholding. The topography varies across the landholding and wider area with rolling hills.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the demolition of an existing milking parlour (184.9m<sup>2</sup>) and the construction of the following:
  - A milking parlour (885m<sup>2</sup>) with associated collecting yard (629m<sup>2</sup>), dairy and handling facilities,
  - A livestock shed with slatted tanks (5,814m<sup>2</sup>), and
  - A silage pit (1,185m<sup>2</sup>).

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Request for Further Information

Prior to issuing a notification of decision, the Planning Authority issued a further information request on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2021 requiring details in relation to justification for the scale of the proposed cubicle shed, a revised Farmyard Management Plan, improvements to sightlines and stopping distances at the entrance, addressing the issues raised by the third party, and a comprehensive landscaping scheme. The first

party submitted revised drawings demonstrating works to the southwestern entrance, a covered collection yard, a landscaping scheme, and a Nutrient Management Plan.

### 3.2. **Decision**

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to Grant for the development on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 subject to 11 No. conditions. The Conditions include inter alia the following:

- Condition No. 4: a new roadside boundary shall be constructed per drawing number 204-PL2.
- Condition No.5: All deliveries to the farm shall be via the southwest entrance.
- Condition No. 10: All surface water run-off shall be collected and disposed of within the site to soakpits / adjacent watercourses and no such surface water shall discharge onto the public road.

### 3.3. **Planning Authority Reports**

#### 3.3.1. **Planning Reports**

There are two Planning Reports on file dated 10<sup>th</sup> June 2021 and 29<sup>th</sup> September 2021, respectively. The Planning Officer in the former report refers to the policy context for the development. The scale of the proposed development was regarded as large in comparison to other farm buildings on the site, which was recommended to be addressed by further information. In addition, further information was recommended in relation to the site access, waste and surface water disposal, and landscaping.

The second Planner's Report (dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 2021) refers to the further information submitted and considered that, having regard to the additional information and comments the Environment Section, permission should be granted subject to 11 No. conditions.

#### 3.3.2. **Other Technical Reports**

**Environment Section** (19<sup>th</sup> May 2021): The Environmental Technician requested a site specific waste management plan for the recovery / disposal of all wastes to

include a list of all waste collection permit holders, a list of all proposed authorised waste facilities to be used, and estimates of the proposed volumes of C & D waste and types that will accrue as a result of the proposed demolition works.

**Environmental Section** (a second report dated 1<sup>st</sup> September 2021): Recommends granting permission subject to conditions including those in relation to the storage and the management of soiled water.

### 3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

None.

### 3.5. **Third Party Observations**

A submission was received from Noel Halpin. The issues raised are generally similar to those referenced in the grounds of appeal. These include concerns regarding improper display of the site notice, inadequacy of the documentation, the scale of the proposed development in terms of visual impact and road safety, pollution and adverse environmental impact.

## 4.0 **Planning History**

### 4.1.1. **Appeal site:**

**P.A. Ref. No. 94/501:** Permission granted for the conversion of a silage shed to cubicles and for the construction of two easy feeds and a silage base.

## 5.0 **Policy Context**

### 5.1. **Limerick County Development Plan 2010-2016 (as extended)**

#### 5.1.1. The subject site is located on unzoned lands.

#### **Objective ED O22: Agricultural Developments**

'The Council will normally permit development proposals for agricultural development where:

- a) They are appropriate in nature and scale to the area in which they are located;
- b) The proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding or enterprise;
- c) Where the proposal involves the erection of buildings, there are no suitable redundant buildings on the farm holding which would accommodate the development;
- d) The development is not visually intrusive in the landscape and, where the proposal is for a new building(s) and there are no suitable redundant buildings, the proposal is sited adjacent to existing buildings and suitably visually integrated in the holding; and
- e) The proposal demonstrates that it has taken into account traffic, environmental and amenity considerations and is in accordance with the policies, requirements and guidance contained in this Plan.'

### **Section 10.8 Agricultural Development**

'Agricultural buildings and associated works (walls, gates, entrances, fences, yards, etc...) while accepting the need to be functional, are required to be sympathetic to their surroundings – in scale, materials and finishes. Buildings should relate to the landscape and should avoid breaking the skyline.'

#### **5.2. National Guidelines and Legislation**

The following legislation is relevant:

EU (Good Agricultural Practices for the Protection of Waters) Regulations (2017) Statutory Instrument (SI) No.605 of 2017, as amended by SI No.65 of 2018.

#### **5.3. Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is not located within or close to any European site. The closest Natura 2000 site is the Ballyhoura Mountains SAC (site code: 002036) approx. 10km to the south.

## 5.4. EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class of development for which EIA is required.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. A third party appeal was submitted by Noel Halpin. The issues raised are as follows:

- Queries the validity of the application on a number of bases, namely:
  - (i) Contends that the location of the site notice advertising the significant further information submitted to the Planning Authority was outside of the site edged red,
  - (ii) Contends that no second site notice was erected at the second entrance to the farm,
  - (iii) States that land ownership details are incorrect,
  - (iv) Contends that drawings submitted with the planning application were missing necessary details, and
  - (v) That the decision to grant permission was made prior to the expiry of the closing date of receipt of submissions on the significant further information submitted to the Planning Authority.
- Claims that the information submitted with the planning application in relation to waste calculations and storage, cattle numbers, disposal of surface water, water supply, access to the farmyard, and landscaping plan is inadequate to justify the size and scale of the proposed development.
- Contends that no attempt has been made to assess the impact of such a large development on the rural landscape.
- Outlines general concerns about the broader sustainability and environmental issues in relation to carbon and methane outputs from the dairy industry.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. A response to the appeal was submitted by the First Party, Thomas & Geraldine O'Connor. The issues raised are as follows:

- Outlines justification for the proposed development with their son, Colm, returning from abroad to become involved in the running of the farm.
- States that appellant is also a dairy farmer residing approx. 3km from the appeal site and may have objected to the proposed development due to the Frist Parties previously objecting to a proposed industrial development on the appellant's land 12 years ago.
- Contends that the appellant does not state how the proposed development would affect him directly or indirectly.
- Submits information from their agricultural consultant (Grasstec) stating:
  - (i) Site notice was located in correct position,
  - (ii) A second site notice is only required when a site is bounded by two separate public roads,
  - (iii) Land ownership details were submitted as further information,
  - (iv) Adequate sections and contiguous elevations were previously submitted,
  - (v) Contends that Limerick County Council are not technically required to wait for submissions at further information stage,
  - (vi) Waste calculations are accurate,
  - (vii) Stock numbers were submitted as further information,
  - (viii) Storm water will be catered for in soakaways around the site,
  - (ix) There is an adequate water supply in place on the farm,
  - (x) Toilet facilities are available in the nearby farm residence,
  - (xi) The proposed modifications to the entrance will significantly improve road safety,



- (xii) All existing trees around the site will be retained and a landscaping scheme will be implemented,
- (xiii) The applicants are using clover in a reseeded strategy, will install solar panels and have purchased a low emissions slurry spreading vacuum tank to reduce carbon outputs, and that the increase in herd size does not result in an increase to the national herd as the herd is replacing other livestock.

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

6.3.1. The Planning Authority responded stating that:

- The Planning Authority is satisfied that 90m sightlines are achievable from 3.5m setback at the existing southwest access that is used for HGV deliveries, and all contained within the blue landholding submitted with the application.
- The Agricultural Scientist was satisfied with the documentation submitted.

## 7.0 Assessment

I consider that the main issues relevant to this appeal are as follows:

- Validity of application and other issues,
- Visual impact,
- Waste storage capacity and disposal,
- Surface water disposal,
- Traffic and road safety, and
- Appropriate Assessment.

### 7.1. Validity of application

#### 7.1.1. Site Notice

The appellant contends that no site notice was erected at the second entrance to the farm.

Article 19 (1) (c) of the Planning & Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended) requires a site notice to be 'securely erected or fixed in a conspicuous position on or near the main entrance to the land or structure concerned from a public road, or where there is more than one entrance from public roads, on or near all such entrances, or on any other part of the land or structure adjoining a public road...'.

The application does indicate that a site notice was erected at the main entrance to the appeal site and the Planning Authority noted that the site notice was present and did not determine that a second site notice was required. In terms of procedural matters and the alleged irregularities in terms of the erection of a second site notice, on the basis of the information available I am satisfied that the requirements of the regulations were met and there is no clear basis to invalidate the application.

#### 7.1.2. Significant further information

The appellant contends that the location of the site notice advertising the significant further information submitted to the Planning Authority was outside of the site edged red. It is also contended that the decision to grant permission was made prior to the expiry of the closing date for receipt of submissions on the significant further information submitted to the Planning Authority.

No site notice was present at the time of my inspection of the appeal site and it is not clear on the basis of the information available whether the site notice advertising significant further information was outside of the red line boundary. I do not therefore consider that there is a clear basis for the Board to determine that the application should be deemed invalid by reason of deficiencies in the public notices.

Regarding dates of decision and further information, I note correspondence on the file to the Third Party from the Planning Authority (dated 23/09/2021) confirming that the Third Party had 10 working days from the day the Planning Authority received the significant further information (22/09/2021) to make further submissions i.e., until 5<sup>th</sup> October 2021. As stated earlier in this report, the Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to Grant for the development on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 subject to 11 No. conditions.

Article 30 of the Planning and Development regulations is the only part of the legislation that specifically refers to minimum time periods for the determination of a planning application and this states 'A planning authority shall not determine an

application for permission until after a period of 5 weeks, beginning on the date of receipt of an application, has elapsed’.

It would therefore appear that the Planning Authority decided the application prior to the expiry of the period cited in their correspondence of 22/09/2021 and referenced in the revised public notices. However, I note that no minimum time period regarding the determination of applications post the receipt of further information is specified in the legislation and, therefore, consider that there is no clear basis to deem the application invalid.

#### 7.1.3. Inadequacy of documentation

The appellant contends that there is inadequate documentation / information submitted with the planning application in relation to waste calculations and storage, cattle numbers, disposal of surface water, water supply, access to the farmyard, and landscaping plan is inadequate to justify the size and scale of the proposed development.

The requirement for details to be submitted with a planning application are outlined in Articles 22 and 23 of the Planning & Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended). I am satisfied that the First Party has complied with the requirements of the legislation. During the assessment of the planning application, the Planning Authority sought further information where it deemed there were deficits in the documentation / information submitted and, where relevant, this information is considered in the assessment below.

#### 7.1.4. Development Contributions

The appellant notes that no condition was attached to the notification of the decision to grant permission requiring the payment of development contributions.

In this regard, I note that the relevant information in relation to this is contained in the Limerick City & County Council Development Contribution Scheme 2017-2021. The various categories of development that are exempted from the requirement to pay development contributions are listed in Section 8 of this scheme. Under this section, agricultural developments as defined under the Planning & Development Act are listed as being exempt from development contributions.

## 7.2. Visual Impact

- 7.2.1. The Appellant contends that no attempt has been made to assess the impact of such a large development on the rural landscape with mitigation measures such as trees and landscaping considered inadequate. As outlined above, the topography in the general area, and across the 146ha of land comprising the farm, consists of rolling hills. The Applicant has outlined the technical justification for the location of the proposed structures within the centre of the overall landholding (i.e., improved working and environmental conditions). The cubicle shed will have a maximum height of 11.695m, and the milking parlour will measure 8.032m in height. It is proposed that the cubicle shed and milking parlour will both have roofs and sections of their side elevations constructed with green cladding.
- 7.2.2. The proposed cubicle shed and milking parlour, whilst located on the most elevated position on the overall landholding will, I consider, only be visible from the local road to the southwest of the appeal site due to the presence of mature hedgerows throughout this rural landscape. I also consider that the visual impact of the proposed structures from the local road to the southwest will be reduced by the approx. 400m set back from this road.
- 7.2.3. As highlighted by the First Party in their response to the appeal, all existing trees around the site will be retained and a landscaping scheme will be implemented. Whilst I accept that the proposal will have a visual impact on the area, particularly when viewed from the southwest, I consider this to be acceptable having regard to the agricultural appearance of the structures in a rural setting and the set back from the public road. I also consider the green cladding will facilitate the integration of the structures into the landscape. Due to the undulating nature of the landscape, existing hedgerows, proposed landscaping treatment, the distance between the proposed structures and the local road to the southwest, views of the structures from the public roads will be transient and short lived.
- 7.2.4. In conclusion, while I accept that the structures will be visible from the public road to the southwest of the appeal site, in the context of the Development Plan's policy which recognises agriculture as a key contributor to the economic and social viability

of rural areas, I do not consider the proposal to be an unreasonable intrusion on the rural landscape and, therefore, I do not consider that the visual impact is such to justify a refusal.

### **7.3. Waste storage capacity and disposal**

- 7.3.1. The Appellant argues that there is inadequate and insufficient waste storage capacity proposed with the development. These inadequacies are stated to include the use of old pig slurry storage tanks, inaccurate calculation of waste storage capacity of the dairy shed collection yard, inaccuracy of livestock numbers, no effluent tank to take effluent from the dungstead and silage slab, and no evidence of a wastewater treatment system for the disposal of waste from the proposed toilet / canteen / shower facilities for staff.
- 7.3.2. In response to the appeal, the First Party's agent (Grasstec) confirms that the calculations submitted to the Planning Authority at RFI stage for slurry capacity requirement and slurry storage (existing and proposed) are accurate. The slurry capacity required is 4,403m<sup>3</sup> and the storage to be provided would be 4,840m<sup>3</sup> i.e., a surplus of 437m<sup>3</sup>, based on 24 weeks storage. The first Party also confirms that significant repairs and maintenance have been carried out to the 'piggery' tanks over the years to ensure that the tanks are functional and compliant. The First Party states that no toilet facilities will now be provided within the proposed development as adequate facilities are presently available at the nearby residence / farmhouse.
- 7.3.3. I am satisfied that these calculations are in accordance with slurry storage requirements<sup>1</sup> for this type of a farm enterprise based on the numbers of animals (290 no. cows, 138 no. 0-1 year old cattle, and 100 no. 1-2 year old cattle) outlined in the First Party's RFI submitted to the Planning Authority on 12<sup>th</sup> August 2021. I am also satisfied that the figures also include effluent generated from the silage slab as there is a foul line demonstrated from the silage slab to the slatted tank in the cubicle shed (Drawing no. 202 – PL2 refers).
- 7.3.4. I note a discrepancy between the initial calculations and the calculations presented at RFI stage in that the same wastewater calculations accrue in both the initial proposal and revised roofed proposal for the collection yard adjoining the milking

---

<sup>1</sup> P.152, Slurry Storage, Teagasc Dairy Manual 2016

parlour. Logically, the revised roofed collection yard will result in less wastewater generated (calculated at 26mm per week over 24 weeks<sup>2</sup>) and less of a requirement on the waste storage capacity as an amount of water will be directed from this roofed area into the surface water disposal system.

- 7.3.5. In conclusion, I consider the Nutrient Management Plan submitted in respect of the proposed development to be robust and accurate and that there is sufficient storage capacity to accommodate the proposed development with a surplus of at least 437m<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, as outlined above, I do not consider that the proposed development represents a significant risk to water quality and would not be prejudicial to public health.

#### 7.4. Stormwater disposal

- 7.4.1. The Appellant argues that the condition attached to the notification of the decision by the Planning Authority for the disposal of surface water run-off to soakpits and adjacent watercourses is inadequate. He contends that there is no indication of a soakaway or the location of the watercourse on any of the drawings or plans. He also contends that the nearby Ahatrishnaun Stream frequently floods the public road and nearby property. He believes, given the extent of excavation that would be required for the provision of an adequate soakaway, that disposal to a pond would be a better solution and, if the proposed development goes ahead, flooding of the public road and nearby property will be more frequent.
- 7.4.2. In response to the appeal, the First Party's agent (Grasstec) states that the storm water will be catered for in several soakaways around the site as per the site layout plan. I note on site layout plan (Drawing No.202 - PL2) that there are references to a number of soakaways mainly at the northern boundary of the appeal site however, no indication is given of the size of these soakaways to be provided. The First Party has provided no calculations of surface water run-off from the proposed development.
- 7.4.3. I note the Appellant's contention that the watercourse would not be capable of taking the volumes of surface water run-off from the proposed development without exacerbating flooding on the public road. On the day of my site inspection, I

---

<sup>2</sup> P.154, Table 5: Average net rainfall during the specified storage period, Teagasc Dairy Manual 2016

observed the Ahatrishnaun stream running along the northern boundary of the appeal site, crossing the north western access to the farm (culverted), running south west along the side of the public road, and crossing the public road equi-distance between the north western and south western farm accesses and adjacent to a small cottage.

7.4.4. In this regard, I agree with the Appellant that the condition attached to the notification of the decision by the Planning Authority for disposal of surface water run-off to soakpits and adjacent watercourses is inadequate as no calculations for surface water has been provided and, consequently, the impact of this run-off on the Ahatrishnaun Stream cannot be ascertained. I consider that, without accurate calculations for surface water that would be generated from the proposed development, it cannot be categorically stated that the proposed development would not give rise to flooding of the public road if discharge to the stream is permitted and, therefore, I consider the condition attached to the grant of permission by the Planning Authority should be amended to preclude this. Given the extent of the landholding and the greenfield nature of the land, I consider that the surface water run-off from the proposed development can be adequately disposed of via appropriately sized soakaways only. I recommend that the Board include a condition to this effect, if a grant of permission is issued.

7.4.5. In conclusion, having regard to the nature of the proposed development, the size of the landholding, the proposed extent of hard surface and roof areas, the distance of the appeal site from the public road and nearby houses, the greenfield nature of the surrounding lands, the topography of the appeal site and surrounding area, and the disposal of surface water to soakaways, I do not consider that there is a significant risk of flooding to the public road or to nearby properties as a result of the proposed development. On the basis of the above, I do not recommend that planning permission is refused on grounds of potential impacts of stormwater disposal.

## 7.5. **Traffic and road safety**

7.5.1. The Appellant has raised road safety concerns in relation to how the proposed development would be accessed and problems that he identifies with the design and layout of the southwestern entrance to the farm. He states that it is not possible to determine the extent of increased traffic movements generated by the proposed

development due to the contended ambiguity in cattle numbers. He highlights the fact that both construction and agricultural use will occur on the access road and requests that a condition be attached requiring a traffic management plan for the construction of the proposed development.

- 7.5.2. In response, the First Party contends that the proposed entrance modifications will significantly improve road safety and will be adequate. The modifications include the set back and reinstatement of the roadside boundary at each side of the south western entrance to provide 90m sightlines in both directions (Drawing No. 204 – PL2 refers). On the day of my site inspection, I observed a milk lorry exiting from the south western farm road without any difficulty or presenting obvious traffic safety issues. I note the works proposed to the entrance and I consider that these works would improve the sightlines and road safety both entering and exiting the farm at this location.
- 7.5.3. I note the Third Party's concerns in relation to possible increased traffic movements however, I am satisfied that the proposed development represents a dairy enterprise that is typical of normal activity with associated vehicular movements in a rural area. Typically, these vehicular movements would comprise milk collections, deliveries of animal feed and fertilisers, and some intermittent movement of livestock to a mart / other holding. I consider that these types of vehicular movements could be accommodated on this rural road network.
- 7.5.4. In conclusion, I have reviewed the existing access/egress arrangement and the proposed improvement works at the southwestern farm access in the context of the proposed development and its associated vehicular movements, and I consider that there are no traffic safety issues arising.

## 7.6. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 7.6.1. The site is not located within or close to any European site. The closest Natura 2000 site is the Ballyhoura Mountains SAC (site code: 002036) approx. 10km to the south. There is no hydrological connection to the Ballyhoura Mountains SAC and it has no known habitat to support any of the Special Conservation Interests of this European site.
- 7.6.2. Having regard to the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment, and the separation distance to the nearest



European site, it is concluded that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise as the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on this or any European site.

## **8.0 Recommendation**

I recommend that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions outlined below.

## **9.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the nature, scale and appearance of the proposed development, the nature of the receiving environment, and the provisions of the Limerick County Development Plan 2010-2016 (as extended), it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health, would not be likely to cause a deterioration in the quality of waters in the area and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted to the planning authority on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021, 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.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>All collection and delivery vehicles for the farm shall use the southwestern gate for access / egress as outlined on the site layout plan submitted to the Planning Authority on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of August 2021.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of traffic safety.</p>
3.	<p>A minimum of 24 weeks storage shall be provided on the landholding. Planning permission will be required for any additional storage capacity to accommodate any increase in livestock numbers and type from that outlined in the submitted Nutrient Management Plan with the application.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of environmental protection and public health.</p>
4.	<p>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 the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2014 (as amended).</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure the satisfactory disposal of water material, in the interest of amenity, public health and to prevent pollution of watercourses.</p>
5.	<p>All foul effluent and slurry generated by the proposed 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</p>

	<p>discharge or be allowed to discharge to any stream, river or watercourse, or public road.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>(a) All uncontaminated roof water from buildings and clean yard water shall be separately collected and discharged in a sealed system to soakaways and shall not discharge or be allowed to discharge to the storage tanks, a watercourse or the public road.</p> <p>(b) The applicant / developer shall submit to, and agree in writing with, the Planning Authority, the design and locations of these soakaways prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>(c) Inspection manholes shall be installed on all surface water collection systems/pipelines prior to their discharge point to the soakaways in accordance with the submitted details.</p> <p>The discharge points to the soakaways shall be constructed in accordance with the submitted details, shall be monitored and inspected on a weekly basis with inspection records of the discharge inspection by the Planning Authority or other statutory body on request. Where a discharge of potentially polluting mater is noted the Planning Authority shall be notified immediately.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In order to ensure that the capacity of effluent and storage tanks is reserved for their specific purposes and in the interest of public health.</p>
7.	<p>On completion of the construction of the proposed milking parlour and handling area, the existing milking parlour shall cease operation and be permanently removed.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> In the interests of proper planning and orderly development.</p>
8.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including hours of working, noise</p>

	management measures and off-site disposal of construction / demolition waste. <b>Reason:</b> In the interests of public safety and residential amenity.
9.	Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with the On-site Construction Waste Management Plan submitted in respect of the application. <b>Reason:</b> In the interest of sustainable waste management.

---

Liam Bowe  
Planning Inspector

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021