



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-317472-23

Development	Construction of a house and all associated site works.
Location	Shanco , Carrickmacross , Co. Monaghan
Planning Authority	Monaghan County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	22428
Applicant(s)	Seamus McEnaney
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse Permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Seamus McEnaney
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	26 th January 2024
Inspector	Ronan O'Connor

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	6
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.3. Natural Heritage Designations	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Planning Authority Response	10
6.3. Observations.....	10
7.0 Assessment.....	10
8.0 Recommendation.....	16
9.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	16
10.0 Conditions	16
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located approximately 4.7km east of Shercock and 8km north-west of Carrickmacross. The site is irregular in shape and the stated site area is 2.892 Ha. The site comprises a northern portion which is a field bounded by mature trees and hedgerow, and a southern portion which is a part of an existing field, bounded by hedgegrows and trees to the northern and eastern boundaries. The site is accessed via a private laneway, which in turn is accessed off the R178 road. At the time of my site visit, works were underway on this private laneway. The surrounding area is characterised by undulating drumlin landscape.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a new two storey residential dwelling comprising 3 no. bedrooms. Provision of a detached single storey garage. Provision of a soakaway for use with SuDS for surface water drainage. Provision of an on-site foul drainage treatment system. Provision of hard and soft landscaping, and all ancillary works necessary to facilitate the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refuse permission for 2 no. reasons as per below:

1. The proposed development fails to comply with Policy RHP 1 'Design of Rural Housing', Table 15.4 'Design guidelines for Rural Housing' and Section 3.6.1 'Siting and Design of Rural Housing' by reason of its siting, layout, design, form and proposed finishes. Consequently, the development would, if permitted as proposed, materially contravene Policy RHP 1, Table 15.4 and Section 3.6.1 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025 and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed development fails to comply with policy RCP 1 'Buildings in the Countryside' in that the dwelling proposed would be unduly prominent in the landscape and would cause detrimental impact on the rural character of the local

area. Consequently, the development would, if permitted as proposed, materially contravene Policy RCP 1 of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025 and be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. The First Planner's Report [dated 19th November 2022] is summarised below:

- Notes that the site lies within Category 2 'Remaining Rural Area'.
- States that the previous permission 08/349 has long expired and carries little weight in the determination of the current application.
- Concerns remain that the proposal would have an adverse visual impact on the local landscape
- Particular concerns with the excessive length and height of the dwelling, and the fact that the site does not take sufficient advantage of existing site boundaries to aid integration.
- Proposal will have an unacceptable impact on the rural character.
- Solid to void ratio would not be in keeping with the traditional vernacular/almost all elevations are dominated by glazing/length of dwelling exceeds recommendations contained within the design guidelines/materials do not reflect the locality
- Would not materially injure the Recorded Monument (lies within 100m of same)

3.2.3. Further Information was requested on 16th November 2022 in relation to:

1. Amended details demonstrated how dwelling can be sufficiently integrated into the site/local landscape
2. Revised plans/details in relation to roof form, extent of glazing, materials and ancillary works
3. Details in relation to visibility splays/legal agreements relating to same; surface water management details

3.2.4. FI was submitted on 11th May 2023. The Second Planner's Report [dated 6th June 2023] is summarised below:

In response to FI point 1:

- Concerns remain that the dwelling would remain unduly prominent and have an adverse visual impact on the local landscape
- Refers to dwelling under construction on a nearby site (granted under 21/409)/stated that this takes better advantage of established vegetation and surrounding topography
- Proposal as submitted would appear as a skyline development/at a prominent position in the local landscape, particularly when viewed from points 1 and 2.
- Submitted revised details do not address the previously stated visual amenity concerns.

In response to Point 2:

- Notes that the applicant has made design changes including a reduction in roof size, reduction in overall ridge height by 1m, reduction in quantum of glazing (from 47% to 37%) and removal of ancillary works (including decking, concrete steps and stone plants).
- Concerns remain in relation to the overhanging roof design/give the dwelling an overly suburban appearance

In response to Point 3:

- MD Engineer has reviewed same and has no objections, subject to conditions. Proposed access arrangements are therefore considered acceptable.

3.2.5. Other Technical Reports

- Environmental Health Officer – No objection subject to conditions
- Roads MD: Additional Information requested
- Road Design: Additional Information requested

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- An Taisce: No comments received

- DOECLG: No comments received

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. None received.

4.0 Planning History

21/271 – Dwelling – Application withdrawn

08/349 – Dwelling - Grant Permission [decision date 21/11/2008]

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The site is in a rural, unzoned part of County Monaghan. The Core Strategy Map, Map 2.1, identifies that the site is NOT within an ‘area under strong urban influence’ but lies within the ‘Remaining Rural Area’ (Category 2 – Rural Area Type). This area comprises all other rural areas outside of the settlements and the rural areas under strong urban influence. Within the remaining rural area, it is recognised that sustaining smaller community areas is important and as such it is considered appropriate to facilitate rural housing in accordance with the principles of proper planning and sustainable development. In these areas the challenge is to retain population and support the rural economy while seeking to consolidate the existing village network. This stability is supported by a traditionally strong agricultural economic base.

Policy Objective RSP 3 ‘Rural Settlement Policy’ – Remaining Rural Area

‘To facilitate rural housing in the remaining rural areas subject to the relevant planning policies as set out in Development Management Chapter of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025.’

Other relevant rural housing policies include: -

HSP15: To require all applications for rural housing to comply with the guidance set out in Development Management Chapter.

HSP16: To ensure that rural housing applications employ site specific design solutions to provide proposals that integrate into the landscape and that respect their location in terms of siting, design, materials, finishes and landscaping.

HSP17: To require that new houses in the rural areas ensure the protection of water quality in the arrangements for on-site waste water disposal, ensure provision of a safe means of access in relation to road and public safety and ensure the conservation of sensitive areas such as natural habitats, the environs of protected structures and other aspects of heritage.

HSP18: Apply a presumption against extensive urban generated rural development, ribbon development, unsustainable, speculative driven residential units in order to safeguard the potential for incremental growth of the towns and their potential beyond the plan period, to utilise existing physical and social infrastructure and to avoid demand for the uneconomic provision of new infrastructure.

Chapter 15 Development Management Standards contains standards and requirements that are relevant to rural housing proposals.

5.2. **National Planning Policy Framework**

National Policy Objective 19 is of relevance to the proposed development. It requires the following:

‘Ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e. within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:

In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements;

In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements’.

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.3.1. The site is not located within a European site. The closest such site is Stabannan-Braganstown SPA (Site Code 004091) which is approximately 26.7km to the south-east. The nearest nationally designated site is Loughbawn House Loughs pNHA (001595).

5.4. **EIA Screening**

- 5.4.1. See completed Form 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development, and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

5.5. **Appropriate Assessment**

- 5.5.1. Having regard to the minor nature and scale of the proposed development, the site location outside of any protected site, the nature of the receiving environment and the proximity of the lands in question to the nearest European Site (Stabannan-Braganstown SPA [Site Code 004091] which is approximately 26.7km to the south-east), it is my opinion that no Appropriate Assessment issues arise and that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on any Natura 2000 site.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1.1. A First Party Appeal against the Council's decision to refuse permission was submitted on 29th June 2023. The First Party grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:
- MMC have not provided a comprehensible justification for refusing the application
 - Development is compliant with the standards and objectives of the Monaghan County Development Plan and other relevant regional and national planning policy

- Notes that the dwelling approved under 2008 (PA Ref 08349) occupied a much larger footprint and was higher than the proposed dwelling
- Nearby house granted under Reg Ref 21/409, currently under construction, has a far greater impact on the landscape than the proposed dwelling/this approved dwelling does not conform to the rural housing design objectives found the Development Plan/Similar policies apply in the new Development Plan
- PA is not consistent in its appeal to rural housing/have set a precedent for houses being developed on higher ground
- In comparison with the above approval, the dwelling under consideration here has the benefit of screening by mature trees and hedgerows
- Dwelling has been design to utilise the topography of the site, which slopes towards the main road towards the proposed dwelling
- It will be partially visible from adjoining roads/will have minimal impact on the landscape due to the reduced scale, building materials and extensive planting of mature trees on the grounds
- Amendments at FI stage have reduced any potential impact the dwelling may have on the landscape
- Materials have been chosen to sit comfortably within the landscape/natural slate roof and hardwood finishes
- The landscape plan proposed extensive woodlands planting to the south and southwest of the proposed dwelling which will create a natural screen
- There are no protected views located in the vicinity of the proposed dwelling (Map 6.1)
- Design and setting has been carefully considered, taking to account the principles as outlined in Section 15.17 Housing in the Rural Area of Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025
- House is based on a traditional farm dwelling layout, has a simple linear plan form with a single-pitched roof with natural slates

- Whilst the proposed dwelling breaks the ridgeline when viewed from certain areas, the context is considered important when assessing this. The proposed development makes use of the natural contours of the landscape and existing planting which dominates the ridgeline behind the dwelling.
- The house appears as single storey when viewed from the south/lower ground flood is concealed
- Dwelling is set back 500m from the road/Existing trees and hedgerows will be maintained
- Wall surface area remains greater than the window or door openings at all elevations
- The traditional pattern of settlement in the area can be characterised by rural one-off housing and farmyard/ranging from single to two storeys/proposed development follows this pattern
- Request that Planning Permission be granted.

6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

6.2.1. None received.

6.3. **Observations**

6.3.1. None received.

7.0 **Assessment**

7.1. Having inspected the site and considered the contents of the appeal in detail, I consider the main planning issues to be considered are:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Visual Impact
- Other Issues

7.2. **Principle of Development**

- 7.2.1. The site is in a rural, unzoned part of County Monaghan, approximately 8km north-west of Carrickmacross. The Core Strategy Map, Map 2.1, identifies that the lies within the 'Remaining Rural Area' (Category 2 – Rural Area Type) and not within an area 'under strong urban influence'. As such Policy Objective RSP 3 'Rural Settlement Policy' applies in this instance, which seeks to facilitate rural housing in these areas subject to the planning policies as set out in the Development Management Chapter of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025.
- 7.2.2. Given the location of the site, and the applicable policy (RSP 3) I note that there is no requirement to demonstrate rural need for the dwelling house, and therefore I am of the view that a dwelling house at this location, is acceptable in principle.

7.3. Design and Visual Impact

- 7.3.1. Reasons for Refusal No's 1 and 2 refer to the design and siting of the proposed dwelling (Reason No. 1) as well as the visual impact of same on the landscape and the impact on the rural character of the area (Reason No. 2). The Planning Authority were of the view the proposal was contrary to Policy RCP 1, Table 15.4 and Section 3.6.1 of the Monaghan County Development Plan.
- 7.3.2. Policy RCP 1 states that the council will only grant planning permission for a building in the countryside where it is demonstrated that the development will not cause a detrimental impact or further erode the rural character of the area. Any new building will be unacceptable where;
- It is unduly prominent in the landscape
 - It results in build-up of development when viewed with existing and/or approved buildings and where it would detrimentally impact on the rural character of the area. - It does not respect the traditional pattern of settlement within the area.
 - It creates or adds to a ribbon of development except where it is considered infill or a replacement building. –
 - The impact of the ancillary works including the creation of visibility splays would damage the rural character of the area.
- 7.3.3. Policy RHP 1 states that 'Applications for one- off housing in the rural areas shall demonstrate compliance with the design guidelines as set out in Table 15.4 "Design Guidelines for Rural Housing". Table 15.4 sets out a number of criteria that should

be considered including a site study, orientation, energy efficiency, scale, form, proportions, materials, detailing, boundaries and features. Policy HSP16 seeks to ensure that rural housing applications employ site specific design solutions to provide proposals that integrate into the landscape and that respect their location in terms of siting, design, materials, finishes and landscaping

- 7.3.4. The first party appellant has set out that the proposal is traditional in character, form and materials, and has taken advantage of the landscape and existing mature trees and hedgerows and disputes that the proposed dwelling will have a detrimental impact on the landscape.
- 7.3.5. I note the scale of the proposed dwelling was reduced at Further Information Stage, reducing the originally proposed ridge height by 1m (from 9.1m to 8.1m), and reducing the roof depth from 4.5m to 3.25m. The length of the roof was decreased from 34.6m to 33m, reducing the overhanging roof by 1.6m. The revised window to glass ratio is 37%, reduced from 48%. Materials proposed include a slate roof, aluminium windows, hardwood timber on the upper ground floor level and rubble natural stone on the lower ground floor.
- 7.3.6. Having regard to the revised drawings, the overall depth of the two-storey dwelling is 27.3m, with a gable width of 7.7m. The plan is a simple linear form with a pitched roof. I would note that this form is in keeping with the dwelling form espoused in Table 15.4. Table 15.4 sets also out general guidance in relation to dimensions. The proposed dwelling does not strictly adhere to same. I am not of the view however, that the dwelling is excessive in scale, and I note that the dwelling as approved in 2008 has a floor area that was significantly larger than this proposed dwelling (2008 approval was 971 sq. m – dwelling proposed here 582 sq. m, as per the application form).
- 7.3.7. From a reading of the report of the Planner, the main concern in relation to the detailed design, following the submission of Further Information, appears to be the overhanging roof design, which was considered to be of a suburban appearance. While the initial Planner's report cited excessive length and height, the subsequent Planner's report following the amendments to the proposal (as set out above) does not. In relation to this overhanging roof, this was reduced substantially at Further Information Stage, and I am not of the view that this is an unduly prominent feature

of the dwelling, and I am not of the view that it gives the dwelling a suburban character. I am of the view that the proposed linear plan form with the pitched roof, has sufficient regard to the vernacular of the area, and when viewed with the proposed garage building, draws reference to a traditional farmhouse grouping, with the solid to void ratio of the main dwelling in keeping with the guidance as set out in Table 15.4. The materials proposed are appropriate in my view, and served to reduce the overall visual impact of the proposed dwelling, as discussed below. The roof is natural slate which is cited as the preferred material in Table 15.4. Stone detailing is also an accepted material. While hardwood is not explicitly set out as an accepted material, it is not prohibited either. Overall, I am of the view that the detailed design of the proposed dwelling is acceptable, and has taken appropriate cognisance of the guidance as set out in Table 15.4 of the Development Plan.

- 7.3.8. Reason for refusal No. 2 refers to visual impacts and impacts on the landscape. In relation to same, views from points 1 and 2 (as set out in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and the Photomontage Document) were of particular concern, with reference to the report of the Planner.
- 7.3.9. A 'Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (May 2023) was submitted to the Planning Authority at Further Information Stage. This notes that the character of the area is defined by rolling drumlins. This document assesses 5 no. viewpoints towards the site. I note that this document is also supported by a Photomontage Document which illustrates the same 5 no. viewpoints. View 1 is from a local road looking north-east towards the site, and Views 2 to 5 are views from the R178 facing north and north-west. A low impact is predicted from View 1, with mainly the slate roof of the dwelling visible. In relation to view 2, a larger proportion of the dwelling will be visible from this viewpoint, although the LVIA concludes that due to the existing trees and hedgerows, as well as proposed planting, the impact will be low. In relation to View 3, only a small part of the roof would be visible from this viewpoint and it is concluded there is no perceivable impact from this viewpoint. The gable end of the dwelling is visible from View 4, and it is concluded that due to the design and colour the proposed dwelling would be less visible than other dwellings visible from this location. Notwithstanding, the LVIA concludes that there would be slight adverse impact when compared with the existing situation. With the proposed planting however, this impact was considered negligible. The southern gable end is visible

from View 5. The LVIA concludes the impact of same as negligible given the design and material chosen which blend into the landscape as much as possible for a new dwelling.

7.3.10. In relation to the above conclusions, I would generally concur with same. While somewhat elevated, the proposed dwelling does not site on the highest elevation of the site, with the site elevation rising behind the proposed dwelling, forming a backdrop to same when viewed from certain vantage points, Views 4 and 5 in particular. The positioning of the dwelling takes advantage of the contours of the site, to minimise the visual impact of same, most notably from those shorter views from View 1 (where it is mainly the roof form that is visible) and View 3 (where the gable end is partly visible through the existing vegetation). The site utilises the natural boundaries of mature trees and hedgerows to either screen the proposed dwelling or to soften the impact of same against the skyline, with higher ground and mature boundaries forming the backdrop to some views, as noted above. In relation to the 5 no. views as set out in the LVIA (and the accompanying photomontage document), the proposal is most visible from View 2 (from the R178 road). However, the dwelling still sits within the landscape, with the contours of the site and existing vegetation providing some screening. The planting proposed further reduces the visual impact. I would also note the distance of the proposed dwelling from this viewpoint, which is approximately 500m, which has the effect of further diminishing any visual impact or impact on the character of the landscape. The gable end is visible from Viewpoints 3, 4 and 5, but again the distance is significant (at least 500m from Viewpoint 3, at least 600m from Viewpoint 4 and at least 850m from Viewpoint 5), and the form and materials of the proposed dwelling serve to soften any impact, as does the proposed planting, which serves to further screen the proposed dwelling from all the viewpoints considered.

7.3.11. Overall, I am of the view that there will not be any significant adverse visual impacts or significant adverse impacts on the character of the landscape resulting from the proposed dwelling, and the design and siting of the proposed dwelling has had sufficient regard to the criteria as set out in Table 15.4 of the Development Plan.

7.4. **Other Issues**

Wastewater

- 7.4.1. The Site Characterisation Form submitted with the application identifies the category of aquifer as 'Poor Aquifer', with a vulnerability classification of 'extreme'. Table E1 (Response Matrix for DWWTs) of the EPA Code of Practice Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems identifies an 'R2¹' response category i.e. *'acceptable subject to normal good practice. Where domestic water supplies are located nearby, particular attention should be given to the depth of subsoil over bedrock such that the minimum depths required in Chapter 6 are met and the likelihood of microbial pollution is minimised'*. The Site Suitability Report notes that the site is not near a water supply source, with the nearest being 15km from the site, east of Carrickmacross.
- 7.4.2. The Site Characterisation Form indicates that a trial hole with a depth of 2.1m recorded loam topsoil to a depth of 0.5m, then SILT to 1.3m. with Gravelly SILT/loose bedrock, which was found to be highly permeable, below this. The water table was encountered at a depth of 2.05m below ground level. Bedrock was not encountered. In relation to the percolation characteristics of the soil, a sub-surface percolation test result of 8.44min/25mm (previously known as a 'T' Test) was returned. A surface percolation test result of 8.56min/25mm was returned (previously known as a 'P' Test). These are both within the range as set out in the EPA Code of Practice (which requires a percolation value of at least 3, but not greater than 50 (for a septic tank) or 90 to 120 (for varying types of secondary treatment systems)).
- 7.4.3. The report concludes that the site is suitable for the installation of a secondary or tertiary treatment system, discharging to ground water. The recommended treatment system is a packaged wastewater treatment system and polishing filter, details of which, including plans and sections, are set out in the 'Surface Water Drainage Design Report'. I note the a raised percolation area is proposed to ensure sufficient depth between the invert of the trench to the loose/highly permeable rock encountered at a depth of 1.3m.
- 7.4.4. Having regard to the site percolation test results, and the supporting documentation accompanying the application, I consider it has been demonstrated that the site can accommodate a wastewater treatment system as recommended in the Site Characterisation Form, subject to the system being installed as recommended and in line with the EPA Code of Practice – Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10), 2021. I also note the Planning Authority's Environmental Health Officer did not express any concern regarding this aspect of the development nor has the

suitability of the site to accommodate a wastewater system been raised by any parties.

- 7.4.5. Should the Board decide to grant permission, I recommend a condition be attached requiring the applicant to agree the detailed specification of the on-site wastewater treatment system with the Planning Authority.

8.0 Recommendation

- 8.1. Having regard to the foregoing assessment it is considered that the proposed development should be granted for the following reasons and considerations and in accordance with the following conditions.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development of a dwelling in an area designated 'Remaining Rural Area' and outside of an area that is defined as being 'under strong urban influence', is acceptable in principle, having regard to the provisions of the Monaghan County Development Plan 2019-2025. The proposed house design would not detract from the visual or residential amenities of the area, nor would there be any significant adverse impacts on the character of the landscape. The site is suitable for the disposal and treatment of effluent. The proposed development would accordingly be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

10.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 11 th Day of May 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 agree particulars.
----	---

	Reason: In the interest of clarity.
2.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Surface water from the site shall not be permitted to drain onto the adjoining public road.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.</p>
3.	<p>All landscaping works shall be completed, within the first planting season following commencement of development, in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 11th Day of May 2023. Any trees and hedging which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of 3 years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of biodiversity and the visual and residential amenity of the area.</p>
4.	<p>(a) The proposed effluent treatment and disposal system shall be located, constructed and maintained in accordance with the details submitted to the planning authority and in accordance with the requirements of the document entitled "Code of Practice – Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e. ≤ 10)" – The Environmental Protection Agency, 2021. Arrangements in relation to the ongoing maintenance of the system shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>(b) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report from a suitably qualified person with professional indemnity insurance certifying that the proprietary effluent treatment system has been installed and commissioned in accordance with the approved details and is working in a satisfactory manner in accordance with the standards set out in the EPA document.</p>

	Reason: In the interest of public health.
5.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</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.

Rónán O'Connor
Senior Planning Inspector

31st January 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	317472-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a house and all associated site works.		
Development Address	Shanco , Carrickmacross , Co. Monaghan.		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? <small>(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)</small>	Yes	Y	
	No		
2. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) and does it equal or exceed any relevant quantity, area or limit where specified for that class?			
Yes			
No		No	Proceed to Q.3
3. Is the proposed development of a class specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) but does not equal or exceed a relevant quantity, area or other limit specified [sub-threshold development]?			
		Threshold	Comment (if relevant)
			Conclusion
No		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	Yes	Class (10)(b) of Schedule 5 Part 2 Construction of more than 500 dwelling units;	1 dwelling house on a site of 2.892 Ha. The applicable site Proceed to Q.4

		Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district, 10 ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere.	area threshold is 20ha.	
--	--	--	-------------------------	--

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	No	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: _____