



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-316159-23

Development	Construct a four-bay shed which will consist of slatted area with slurry holding tank underneath, cubicles and all associated site works.
Location	Drumbo, Killeshandra, Co. Cavan
Planning Authority	Cavan County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	22/488
Applicant(s)	Noel Burns
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant, subject to 8 conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party -v- Decision
Appellant(s)	Wild Ireland Defence CLG
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	12 th September 2023
Inspector	Hugh D. Morrison

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
4.0 Planning History.....	4
5.0 Policy and Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	5
5.3. EIA Screening	5
6.0 The Appeal	6
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	6
6.2. Applicant Response	7
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	9
6.4. Observations.....	9
6.5. Further Responses	9
7.0 Assessment.....	9
8.0 Recommendation.....	15
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	16
10.0 Conditions	16

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located 12 km to the west north-west of Cavan Town and 2.5 km to the north of Killashandra. It lies within drumlin countryside, which is farmed and forested, to the north and west of the complex of lakes centred on Lough Oughter. This site is accessed off the R201 via the local road network (L5505 and L1504).
- 1.2. The site is of irregular shape, and it extends over an area of 0.883 hectares. This site encompasses the applicant's existing farm buildings (1372 sqm) and silage heap, two dwelling houses, and portions of a field to the east and to the north of the existing farmyard.
- 1.3. The site is bound by the local road (L1504) to the south. (Two access points to the yard exist from this road, along with access points to each of the two dwelling houses). The eastern and western boundaries to the said portions of the field adjoining the yard are denoted by hedgerows. (The eastern hedgerow is accompanied by a wet ditch). The northern boundary is undefined "on the ground" at present.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposal would entail the construction of a rectangular, four-bay cattle shed (319 sqm) under a double pitched roof in a position to the north of the existing farmyard. This shed would comprise a central feeding passage with slatted areas on either side and cubicles beyond (Sixteen on the northern side and sixteen on the southern side of the shed). The slatted areas would be served by a slurry holding tank.
- 2.2. Sliding doors would be installed in the gabled eastern and western elevations of the shed, the lower walls of which would be composed of mass concrete above which would be vented vertical sheeting. The roof would be clad in PVC coated metal decking and the sides of the raised apex would be ventilated, too. Uncontaminated water from the shed's roof would be collected and drained to the wet ditch along the site's eastern boundary.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Following receipt of further information, permission granted, subject to 8 conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The case planner observed that the proposal would entail the construction of an agricultural building to standard specifications, and that it would be sited immediately adjacent to the applicant's existing farmyard. As such, this proposal was considered to be acceptable in principle. Further information was however sought with respect to the submission of a Stage 1 screening exercise for appropriate assessment, and the submission of a Stage 2 natural impact study (NIS), as appropriate.

The case planner subsequently drew upon the submitted Stage 1 screening exercise to determine that, taking into consideration the scale of the proposed agricultural shed, the absence of any pathway to the nearest Natura 2000 sites, in-combination effects, and the advice of the Environment consultee, the need to progress to Stage 2 and the submission of a NIS did not arise.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Cavan County Council:

- Environment: Conditions requested, and subsequently attached by PA to its permission.

4.0 Planning History

- 98/306: Retain slatted shed and erect milking parlour: Permitted.
- 07/1423: Extend animal housing facilities: construct a roofed farmyard manure shed, roof over existing dairy wash tank, construct open silage pit with walls and aprons, all to connect to existing yard services: Permitted.
- 20/60: Construct shed for milking parlour and motor room: Permitted.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1. Development Plan

Under the Cavan County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (CDP), the site is shown as lying within a stronger rural area. Section 12.8 of the CDP addresses agricultural buildings and structures. It sets out the following development objectives:

ABS 01

Facilitate the development of environmentally sustainable agricultural activities, whereby watercourses, habitats, areas of ecological importance and environmental assets are protected and development does not impinge on the visual amenity of the countryside.

ABS 02

Ensure developments do not impact on archaeological or heritage features of importance.

ABS 03

Require buildings to be of a design, appearance and material specification that is compatible with the protection of rural amenities.

ABS 04

Require an effective means of farm waste management.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- Lough Oughter and Associated Loughs SAC (000007)
- Lough Oughter SPA (004049)

5.3. EIA Screening

The proposal does not constitute a project for which EIA is required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appellant begins by distinguishing the roles of the Board under the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), the EIA Directive, and the Habitats Directive. It then elaborates on the third of these roles.

- Legal cases are cited which clarify that, under Stage 1 screening, the test is whether the possibility exists of there being a significant effect on a European site: if so, Stage 2 appropriate assessment is needed.

The appellant considers that there is a “total lack of certainty in the information submitted” and so the Board is not in a position to grant permission in compliance with Paragraph 44 of the CJEU case 258/11, i.e., an appropriate assessment “cannot have lacunae and must contain complete, precise and definitive findings and conclusions capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt as to the effects of the works proposed on the protected site concerned.”

- The appellant critiques the PA’s request for further information on the basis that it cites the EU (Natura Habitats) Regulations 1997, which are no longer in force.
- The appellant critiques the applicant’s Screening Report. It draws attention to the first paragraph under the heading S.I. 113 of 2022, and it contends that this paragraph illustrates that the applicant is unaware of the conclusion of CJEU cases 293 & 294/17 in which “projects” encompass “the grazing of cattle and the application of fertilisers on the surface of land or below its surface in the vicinity of Natura 2000 sites”. The Screening Report is thereby dismissed.
- The appellant draws attention to the description of significant effects in the table of the Screening Report on Page 18. This states that “hydrological connectivity between the application site and SAC is not considered to exist...” The appellant contends that there is no evidence that the farmyard drains other than into the SAC.

- The appellant also draws attention to the SAC’s site synopsis, which states that “the main threats to the quality of the site are water polluting activities (such as run-off from fertiliser and slurry application, and sewage discharge) which have raised the nutrient status of some lakes to hypertrophic.”

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant begins by outlining the background to his proposal. At present, he rents a shed c. 3.2km away to house some of his cows. As he only has capacity to store 14 days of soiled dairy washings on his farm, he also stores some of these washings in this off-site shed. The proposal would allow him to house all his cows and soiled dairy washings in his farmyard, and to comply with new 31-day storage and animal welfare requirements. Accordingly, it would not entail any intensification of his farming activities, i.e., no increase in herd numbers or the production of slurry would ensue. Disquiet is expressed over the delay that the appeal has generated in bringing forward his proposal.

The applicant summarises relevant provisions from the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022 (as amended) (S.I. No. 113 and S.I. 393).

The applicant sets out the CDP’s agricultural buildings and structures development objectives ABS 01 – 04 and outlines how the proposal would comply with each of these development objectives.

The applicant responds to the appellant’s grounds of appeal as follows:

- With respect to the legal case cited in connection with the Board’s role under the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended), this case related to a SID rather than the current small-scale Section 34 planning application, and so they are not comparable. Validation of Section 34 planning applications is the prerogative of the PA.
- The PA addressed the question of EIA satisfactorily.
- One of the legal cases cited by the appellant, 259/11 Sweetman & Others -v- An Bord Pleanála, goes on to state that the test of “significant effect” is important as it excludes projects where there would be “no appreciable effect” and so avoids legislative overkill. Furthermore, the tests under Stages 1 and 2

stiffen from no “significant effect” to no “adverse effect on the integrity of a European site”. The applicant’s ecologist has concluded that neither a significant nor an adverse effect would arise under the proposal.

The applicant rejects the appellant’s critique that his Screening Report did not meet the requisite standard. In this respect, he criticises the appellant’s non-site-specific critique, and his failure to acknowledge the environmental impetus for the proposal. He also considers that the appeal is frivolous and vexatious.

- The appellant’s critique of the PA’s further information requested is counterbalanced by the applicant insofar as the legislative provisions cited in his Screening Report are current. Likewise, the PA’s screening determination is cited.
- Exception is taken to the appellant’s critique of the applicant’s ecologist. The view is expressed that the legal cases at issue have effectively been superseded by the provisions of S.I. 113 of 2022 (as amended).
- The appellant’s assertion that the farmyard would drain to the SAC fails to acknowledge that soiled water from farmyards drains into storage tanks, and only rainwater from roofs is drained away. Soiled water is distributed on farmlands in accordance with the provisions of S.I. 113 of 2022 (as amended). The planning system must respect the domain of this separate legal code, just as it does with, for example, the fire regulations.

The applicant’s ecologist has added the following points:

- During the construction phase, there would be no hydrological link between the site and the SAC/SPA. During the operational phase, only rainwater from the building’s roof would be drained away.
- No land-spreading would occur within or adjacent to the SAC/SPA. All land-spreading would occur on improved grasslands in accordance with a current Nutrient Management Plan and S.I. 113 of 2022 (as amended).
- The conclusion of her Screening Report is valid, i.e., no significant effect would arise upon the SAC/SPA, and this conclusion does not rely upon any mitigation measures.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

None

6.4. Observations

None

6.5. Further Responses

None

7.0 Assessment

7.1. I have reviewed the proposal in the light of the Cavan County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 (CDP), relevant planning history, the submissions of the parties, and my own site visit. Accordingly, I consider that this application/appeal should be assessed under the following headings:

- (i) Legalities,
- (ii) In-principle considerations and visual and residential amenities,
- (iii) Water, and
- (iv) Stage 1 screening for appropriate assessment.

(i) Legalities

7.2. The appellant's grounds of appeal essentially draw attention to the applicant's Stage 1 screening exercise for appropriate assessment. It considers that this exercise was inadequate insofar as it did not assess the land spreading that would stem from the distribution of slurry from the proposed slatted cattle shed.

7.3. The applicant has responded by drawing attention to S.I. No. 113/2022 entitled "European Union (Good Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022" (as amended), which effectively set out the parameters for storing and spreading slurry. He contends that the planning system is discrete in its ambit and, just as it does not overlap with matters that are the prerogative of, for example, the fire regulations, so it does not overlap with the matters addressed by these Regulations. Accordingly,

the submitted Stage 1 screening exercise for appropriate assessment, in simply considering the proposed cattle shed, did not err.

7.4. The applicant further contends that the appellant's appeal is "frivolous and vexatious", and so he requests that the Board exercise its discretion under Section 138(1)(a) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 – 2023 (hereafter referred to as "the Act"), to dismiss its appeal. I have considered this request, and I conclude that, while the appeal is largely generic, it does raise matters pertinent to appropriate assessment, and so to that extent it is not "frivolous and vexatious".

7.5. In seeking to respond to the substantive issue raised by the appellant, I recognise that, under Section 4(1)(a) of the Act, development consisting of the use of any land for the purpose of agriculture is expressly stated to be exempted development for planning purposes. I recognise, too, the relevance of the case of Michael Hoey -v- An Bord Pleanála [2018] IEHC 701, which considered whether proper consideration had been given to the spreading of slurry when planning permission was granted for a number of pig houses. In this case, the applicant contended that¹:

- *The respondent erred by concluding the spread of slurry did not require planning permission and that the issue of slurry spread was extraneous to the planning application,*
- *The Natural Impact Statement (NIS) did not consider the effects of the development on special areas of conservation (SAC), and*
- *The decision of the respondent was contrary to Article 6 of the Habitats Directive which requires that any appropriate assessment cannot have a lacuna.*

7.6. In his subsequent judgement, O'Regan J reached the following conclusions²:

- *He stated that whether or not planning permission would be required by individual landowners for the spread of slurry, that was not the application before the respondent.*
- *He was satisfied that when making their decision to grant planning permission for the pig houses, the respondent, having relevant evidence available in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and elsewhere, did consider and evaluate the impact of land*

¹ Summary of the case: [Hoey v an Bord Pleanála - Case Law - VLEX 792890929](#) accessed 14/12/23.

² Summary of the judgement: [Hoey v an Bord Pleanála - Case Law - VLEX 792890929](#) accessed 14/12/23.

spreading slurry, and gave consideration to the SACs in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

- *He also noted that the difference between the respondent's assessment and the PA's assessment did not create a "lacuna" contrary to Article 6 of the Habitat's Directive.*

7.7. In the light of this judgement, I consider that it is in order for the Board to consider the proposal before it, which pertains to the construction of a slatted cattle shed with slurry holding tanks, and whether this proposal, as distinct from any land spreading that may ensue, would have a significant effect upon European sites in the surrounding area. I, therefore, concur with the applicant's position that S.I. No. 113/2022 (as amended) is of relevance in providing a separate legal code to govern land spreading. Consequently, oversight from the planning system is not required.

7.8. I conclude that there are no legal impediments to the Board proceeding to assess/determine the application/appeal in the normal manner.

(ii) In-principle considerations and visual and residential amenities

7.9. The applicant has outlined the impetus for his proposal, which is to bring together his existing farming activities so that they are served solely by his extended farmyard. In doing so he would be in a position to comply with (a) new 31-day requirements for the storage of slurry and soiled dairy washings, and (b) recommended enhanced cubical sizes for animal welfare.

7.10. The proposed cattle shed would be of modern specification with respect to its design and layout. It would be of conventional form, and it would be finished in standard materials. This building would be sited to the north of the existing farmyard and in a position that would align with the existing cluster of modern farm buildings. The building would thus entail the extension northwards of the existing farmyard in a manner that would be visually coherent. Fleeting views of this building would be available to westbound users of the local road, which bounds the existing farmyard to the south. Views from the nearest neighbouring farmhouse to the east would be largely screened by existing hedgerows.

7.11. Separation distances between the proposed cattle shed and the nearest neighbouring farmhouse to the east would be c. 200m, sufficient to ensure that its residential amenities would be unaffected.

- 7.12. Subject to a condition that would allow the PA to check the colours of the finishing materials of the proposed cattle shed, it would therefore comply with Objective ABS 03 of the CDP, which requires “buildings to be of a design, appearance and material specification that is compatible with the protection of rural amenities.”
- 7.13. I conclude that the proposal would be appropriate in-principle and it would be compatible with the visual and residential amenities of the area.

(iii) Water

- 7.14. The farmyard is connected to the public mains and water is supplied under the Milltown Group Water Scheme.
- 7.15. Under the OPW’s flood maps, the site is not identified as being the subject of any formally identified flood risk.
- 7.16. The site layout plan shows how uncontaminated water from the roof of the proposed cattle shed would be collected and drained to the wet ditch along the eastern boundary of the site. The apron to this shed would abut the existing concrete surfaced yard to the south. The site layout plan does not show explicitly how this apron would be drained. (It does show the proposed installation of a linear channel across the access point to this yard from the local road). The implication is that the drainage of the apron would tie in with that of this concrete yard. This should be made explicit by means of a condition. (During my site visit, I observed that a new ditch has been dug across the field beyond the site of the proposed cattle shed. This ditch would intercept surface water run-off from higher ground further to the north of the existing yard, and so it would reduce the amount of surface water run-off reaching this yard).
- 7.17. The proposed cattle shed would contain slatted areas, which would be served by slurry holding tanks. Thus, slurry from cattle housed in the building would be held in these tanks pending its spreading on lands, which are identified in a series of aerial photographs submitted with the application.
- 7.18. Under the proposal, no water issues would arise.

(iv) Stage 1 screening for appropriate assessment

7.19. The requirements of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive as related to screening the need for appropriate assessment of a project under Part XAB, Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 – 2023, are considered fully in this section.

7.20. The applicant has submitted a screening report for appropriate assessment as part of the application. This report reached the following conclusion:

...an AA of the proposed development is not required as it can be excluded, on the basis of objective information provided in this report, that the proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans and projects, will not have a significant effect on any European sites.

7.21. The project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a European site and therefore it needs to be determined if the development is likely to have significant effects on a European site(s).

7.22. The proposed development is examined in relation to any possible interaction with European sites designated Special Conservation Areas (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA) to assess whether it may give rise to significant effects on any European site.

7.23. The applicant provides the following description of the project on page 11 of his screening report: “The construction of a four-bay shed which will consist of slatted area with a slurry holding tank underneath, cubicles, and all associated site works.”

7.24. The applicant also provides a description of the site habitats on page 16 of his screening report.

7.25. Taking account of the characteristics of the proposed development in terms of its location and the scale of works, the following issues are considered for examination in terms of implications for likely significant effects on European sites:

- Construction phase: uncontrolled surface water run-off bearing silt and pollutants, and
- Operational phase: surface water run-off and storage of slurry.

7.26. The development site is not located in or immediately adjacent to a European site. The closest European site is the Lough Oughter and Associated Loughs SAC (000007) and the Lough Oughter SPA (004049), which lie 2km to the south-east.

7.27. The EPA's map of the area surrounding the site shows a stream passing c. 330m to the south of the site of the proposed development. This stream flows east to the above cited SAC and SPA. The applicant's site layout plan shows a watercourse, i.e., a drainage ditch, on the eastern boundary of the application site, which connects with a roadside drainage ditch that accompanies the local road in its westerly descent to the aforementioned stream. Accordingly, there is a hydrological link between the site and the SAC and SPA.

7.28. The Lough Oughter and Associated Loughs SAC has the following qualifying interests, the conservation objectives for which are either to restore (R) or maintain (M) their favourable conservation condition:

- *Natural eutrophic lakes with Magnopotamion or Hydrocharition - type vegetation [3150] – R*
- *Bog woodland [91D0] – M*
- *Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] – M*

7.29. The Lough Oughter SPA has the following qualifying interests, the conservation objectives for which are either to restore (R) or maintain (M) their favourable conservation condition:

- *Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005]*
- *Whooper Swan (Cygnus cygnus) [A038]*
- *Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050]*
- *Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]*

7.30. Potentially, during the construction phase, water borne pollutants from the site could affect the third qualifying interest of the SAC and all the qualifying interests of the SPA. Potentially, too, during the operational phase, slurry from the site could affect these qualifying interests.

- During the construction phase, the use of standard construction practices would ensure that water borne pollutants do not enter the existing drainage ditch on the site.
- During the operational phase, only uncontaminated rainwater from the roof of the proposed building would be collected and discharged to the existing drainage ditch on the site.

- During the operational phase, slurry would be held in tanks of sufficient size to meet the storage requirements set out in S.I. No. 113/2022 (as amended).

These measures would be undertaken to safeguard water quality regardless of the European Sites cited above.

- 7.31. Other plans or projects in the area surrounding the site, which could in combination with the current project affect the SAC and SPA, were the subject of Stage 1 screening for appropriate assessment and, where necessary, Stage 2 appropriate assessment. No cumulative impacts would therefore arise.
- 7.32. No measures designed or intended to avoid or reduce any harmful effects of the project on a European site have been relied upon in this screening exercise.
- 7.33. The proposed development was considered in the light of the requirements of Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 – 2023. Having carried out screening for appropriate assessment of the project, it has been concluded that the likely project individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites Nos. 000007, & 004049, or any other European site, in view of the sites' conservation objectives, and appropriate assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on the following:

- The efficacy of standard construction practices, which ensure that pollutants are not borne into the existing drainage ditch,
- The discharge, during the operational phase, of only uncontaminated rainwater to the existing drainage ditch, and
- The storage, during the operational phase, of slurry within holding tanks of sufficient size to meet the requirements set out in S.I. No. 113/2022 (as amended).

8.0 Recommendation

That permission be granted.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the Cavan County Development Plan 2022 – 2028, it is considered that the proposed farm shed on the site would be an appropriate addition to the existing farmyard, which would further good farming practice. It would be compatible with the visual and residential amenities of the area. No water or appropriate assessment issues would arise. The proposal would thus accord with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 22nd day of February 2023, 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>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The proposed development shall be amended as follows:</p> <p>The drainage arrangements for the apron of the proposed building shall be made explicit. Such arrangements shall not entail the discharge of surface water to the drainage ditch on the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Revised drawings showing compliance with these requirements shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity, and in order to avoid the pollution of the drainage ditch.</p>

3.	<p>Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed building shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
4.	<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 the commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including measures to ensure that pollutants are not borne into the existing drainage ditch on the eastern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity, and in order to avoid the pollution of the drainage ditch.</p>
5.	<p>All uncontaminated roof water from the proposed building shall be separately collected and discharged in a sealed system to existing drains, streams or adequate soakpits and shall not discharge or be allowed to discharge to the foul effluent drains, foul effluent, and slurry storage tanks or to the public road.</p> <p>Reason: In order to ensure that the capacity of effluent and storage tanks is reserved for their specific purposes.</p>
6.	<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 discharge or be allowed to discharge to any stream, river or watercourse, or to the public road.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
7.	<p>Slurry generated by the proposed development shall be disposed of by spreading on land, or by other means acceptable in writing to the planning authority. The location, rate and time of spreading (including prohibited times for spreading) and the buffer zones to be applied shall be in accordance with the requirements of the European Union (Good</p>

	<p>Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations, 2022, as amended.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the satisfactory disposal of waste material, in the interest of amenity, public health, and to prevent pollution of watercourses.</p>
8.	<p>A minimum of 22 weeks storage shall be provided in the underground storage tank. Prior to commencement of development, details showing how it is intended to comply with this requirement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and public health.</p>
9.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution of €500 (five hundred euro) 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. The application of any indexation required by this condition shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine.</p> <p>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.</p>

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, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Hugh D. Morrison
Planning Inspector

15th December 2023

Appendix 1 - Form 1
EIA Pre-Screening
[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-316159-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Construct a four-bay shed which will consist of slatted area with slurry holding tank underneath, cubicles and all associated site works.		
Development Address	Drumbo, Killeshandra, Co. Cavan		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)			
		No	No further action required

Inspector: Hugh D. Morrison Date: 15/12/23