



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-317910-23

Development	Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new 1 storey over basement dwelling
Location	Dunowen, Ardfield, Clonakilty, County Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	22/727
Applicant(s)	Fiona and Decan Soden
Type of Application	Planning Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Declan and Fiona Soden
Observer(s)	Duileach and Kay Ryan
Date of Site Inspection	12 th December 2023
Inspector	Gary Farrelly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.137 hectares and is located within the townland of Dunowen, which is located approximately 2km south of the village of Ardfield, County Cork. The subject site is bounded by a dwellinghouse and access track to the north, a single carriageway public road to the east (L-40092-0), agricultural lands to the west and an agricultural farm complex to the south.
- 1.2. The wider area is characterised by a high density of rural housing. Red Strand beach is located approximately 400 metres to the west of the subject site. An enclosure and souterrain (ref. CO144-042002) are located approximately 70 metres to the north of the subject site. A public road, approximately 200 metres to the west of the site, is designated as a Scenic Route (S75) under the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- 1.3. The topography of the site rises upwards from the east of the site to the west. The elevation ranges from 23.40 metres AOD at the site entrance to 26.70 metres AOD at the location of the existing dwelling. The neighbouring dwellinghouse to the north has a ridge height of 26.50 metres.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought to demolish an existing dwelling and construct a new 1 storey over basement dwelling. The ridge height of the existing dwelling measures 6.48 metres and the total floor area measures 160.5sqm. The ridge height of the proposed dwelling will be c. 8.45 metres (from the basement level), c. 6.8 metres (from the ground floor level) and will have a total floor area of c. 298sqm.
- 2.2. The finished floor level of the existing dwelling is 26.70m AOD. The finished floor level (i.e. basement floor level) of the proposed dwelling will be 23.75m AOD.
- 2.3. The existing access to the site is proposed to be relocated to the south of the site and a new 1 metre high boundary wall is proposed as boundary treatment along the eastern boundary. A new 1 metre high gabion wall is proposed along parts of the northern boundary. The walls of the existing ruinous sheds along the boundary will be retained.

- 2.4. Water supply is proposed to be via a domestic well. There is an existing septic tank onsite and it is proposed to construct a new tertiary wastewater treatment system. A site characterisation form has been submitted which has recorded an onsite subsurface percolation value of 3.83 min/25mm and surface percolation value of 7.22 min/25mm.
- 2.5. The application is accompanied by the following documents:
- Building condition report (This is referenced, however, the PA has confirmed that this was not received)
 - Heritage & Archaeological Assessment;
 - Planning and Design Report;
 - Photomontages.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Cork County Council (The Planning Authority) decided to refuse to grant permission by Order dated 3rd August 2023 for the following reasons.

Reasons for Refusal

1. *Objective HE 16-19 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 sets out to protect, maintain and enhance the established character, forms, features and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements and the contribution they make to our architectural, archaeological, historical, social and cultural heritage and to local character and sense of place and there is a generally presumption in favour of the retention of vernacular buildings. The building proposed for demolition is a characteristic feature of the area and contributes positively to local distinctiveness and place making as set out in objective PL 3-5 which acknowledges that there are distinct and regional patterns of development within the rural areas of County Cork and these make a positive contribution to the rural landscape. The proposed demolition of this vernacular style dwelling and its replacement with a new inappropriate form of development would contravene materially these stated development objectives*

of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 and would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. *The objectives of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 place emphasis on protecting the visual amenities of County Cork's natural environment and the importance of siting of development to minimise visual intrusion and designing with the landscape. Policy Objective RP 5-22 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022 seeks to encourage new dwelling house design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape. The proposed development by virtue of the excessive scale and mass proposed, within this elevated and sensitive coastal location, and the resultant overbearing nature on the designated 'high value landscape' area, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would contravene materially objectives RP 5-22 and GI 14-9 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.*

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Area Planner's report assessed the development in terms of scale and design, impact on European Sites, archaeology and historic landscape, visual impact, front boundary treatment, wastewater treatment and surface water disposal. Further Information was requested seeking, inter alia, retention of the vernacular dwelling, reduction in its scale and massing and the relocation of the building line further back from the northern boundary to limit overlooking and loss of light. Final report did not accept applicant's assertion that dwelling has engineering and safety issues, scale and mass not reduced and refusal recommended. Area Planner's report endorsed by Senior Executive Planner and final report recommended 2 reasons for refusal.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer's Report (dated 26/01/23 and 02/08/23) – First report requested further information on, inter alia, clarification of wastewater treatment assessment, the review of the entrance location and sight distances provided,

legal documentation in relation to an adjoining track and boundary treatment along the track and road frontage. Second report sought clarification in relation to the wastewater treatment proposals, the entrance location and sight distances and boundary treatment.

- Archaeology Report (dated 30/01/23 and 17/07/23) – First report requested a historic building survey, a visual assessment and a redesign to incorporate the existing dwelling. Second report raised major concern with the loss of architectural heritage and recommended refusal.
- Environment Report (dated 13/01/23 and 17/07/23) – First report requested a waste management plan and second report outlined no objection subject to conditions.
- Liaison Officer (Dated 31/07/23) – No comment.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Éireann – No objection subject to conditions.

3.4. Third Party Observations

A total of 5 no. third party submissions were received from Kevin O'Connor, Dorris May and others, Kay & Duileach Ryan, Tommy & Eileen O'Riordan, Michael & Helen Scully who raised a number of issues including negative impact on residential amenity, the sensitivity of the location, the size and appearance of the development, the encroachment onto a public right of way, boundary treatment in terms of height and sightlines and location of the wastewater treatment system.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

PA Ref. 18/335

Retention permission granted for a porch extension to the front and a lean-to extension to the rear of the dwelling.

Adjoining site to the north

PA Ref. 14/674

Duileach and Kay Ryan granted permission for demolition of single storey extensions to an existing cottage, refurbishments, alterations and extensions to the existing cottage with new waste water treatment plant.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028

Objective PL 3-5: Rural Placemaking

The Plan acknowledges that there are distinct and regional patterns of development within the rural villages and rural areas of County Cork and these make a positive contribution to the County's settlement network and rural landscape. New buildings should respond to the historic placemaking patterns and built form prevalent in the area.

Objective RP 5-22: Design and Landscaping of New Dwelling Houses and Replacement Dwellings in Rural Areas

- (a) Encourage new dwelling house design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape.
- (b) Promote sustainable approaches to dwelling design by encouraging proposals to be energy efficient in their design, layout and siting, finishes, heating, cooling, and energy systems having regard to the need to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and reduce carbon emissions.
- (c) Foster an innovative approach to design that acknowledges the diversity of suitable design solutions in most cases, safeguards the potential for exceptional innovative design in appropriate locations and promotes the added economic, amenity and environmental value of good design.

Objective RP 5-29: Replacement Rural Dwellings

In circumstances involving the replacement of an existing habitable dwelling, the Planning Authority will consider proposals for the replacement or refurbishment of such a house, having regard to the requirements of other relevant policies and

objectives in this plan and subject to normal planning considerations. The definition of what constitutes a house will be as described in planning legislation.

Objective HE 16-19: Vernacular Heritage

a) Protect, maintain and enhance the established character, forms, features and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements and the contribution they make to our architectural, archaeological, historical, social and cultural heritage and to local character and sense of place.

b) Cork County Council encourages best conservation practice in the renovation and maintenance of vernacular buildings including thatched structures through the use of specialist conservation professionals and craft persons. Development proposals shall be accompanied by appropriate documentation compiled by experienced conservation consultant.

c) There will generally be a presumption in favour of the retention of vernacular buildings and encouragement of the retention and re-use of vernacular buildings subject to normal planning considerations, while ensuring that the re-use is compatible with environmental and heritage protection.

Objective HE 16-20: Historic Landscapes

a) Recognise the contribution and importance of historic landscapes and their contribution to the appearance of the countryside, their significance as archaeological, architectural, historical and ecological resources.

b) Protect the archaeological, architectural, historic and cultural element of the historic/heritage landscapes of the County of Cork.

c) All new development within historic landscapes should be assessed in accordance with and giving due regard to Cork County Councils 'Guidance Notes for the Appraisal of Historic Gardens, Demesnes, Estates and their Settings' or any other relevant guidance notes or documents issued during the lifetime of the Plan.

Objective GI 14-9: Landscape

The subject site is located within a High Value Landscape area.

(a) Protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork's built and natural environment.

- (b) Landscape issues will be an important factor in all land-use proposals, ensuring that a pro-active view of development is undertaken while protecting the environment and heritage generally in line with the principle of sustainability.
- (c) Ensure that new development meets high standards of siting and design.
- (d) Protect skylines and ridgelines from development.
- (e) Discourage proposals necessitating the removal of extensive amounts of trees, hedgerows and historic walls or other distinctive boundary treatments.

Objective GI 14-13: Scenic Routes

Protect the character of those views and prospects obtainable from scenic routes and in particular stretches of scenic routes that have very special views and prospects identified in this Plan.

- Cork Rural Design Guide: Building a new house in the countryside

National Policy

- Climate Action Plan 2023 (as updated)
- Project Ireland 2040 – National Planning Framework (2018) and National Development Plan 2021-2030

National Policy Objective 17

Enhance, integrate and protect the special physical, social, economic and cultural value of built heritage assets through appropriate and sensitive use now and for future generations.

5.2. Regional Policy

- Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy for the Southern Region

5.3. National Guidance

- Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011)
- 2021 Department for Communities (Northern Ireland) and Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage (Ireland), Caring for our Vernacular Heritage

- 2021 Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, A Living Tradition, A Strategy to Enhance the Understanding, Minding and Handing on our Built Vernacular Heritage
- Sustainable Rural Housing, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005)
- Environmental Protection Agency's 2021 Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)

Other Guidance

- BRE 2022 Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight, A Guide to Good Practice

5.4. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is not located within any designated site. The nearest designated sites are the Galley Head to Duneen Point Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004190), which is located approximately 200 metres south of the subject site, and the Dirk Bay proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA), which is located approximately 300 metres west of the subject site.

5.5. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening

Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development, comprising the demolition and construction of a single one off house in a rural area, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environment impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required. Refer to Appendix 1 regarding this preliminary examination.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal was lodged to the Board on 30th August 2023 opposing the Planning Authority's (PA) decision. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- There are structural issues with the existing dwelling and other issues including dampness, black mould, potential for asbestos which will have detrimental impact on health. A building condition report was prepared as part of the application. Building would be less energy efficient than a new house.
- Building is not within the ACA, is not a protected structure or on the NIAH and no legal obligation to protect it. Original character has been altered with upvc windows and extensions. House is a basic Congested District Board (CDB) house which was a quick housing solution to alleviate congested living conditions in the 1920s and 1930s.
- Clachan type stone developments are a characteristic feature of the area, not CDB style houses built from local aggregates.
- Number of planning precedent cases referenced.
- The existing dwelling onsite is more visible and discordant feature on the landscape than the new house. Photomontages provided.
- The design and narrow house plan adheres to the Cork Rural Design Guide and respects the site's context as visible from Scenic Route S75. The house is set into the topography of the site and finishes in character with traditional barn structures.
- The scale and massing was revised at further information stage. Floor area reduced by 100sqm. The visible building height will only be 6.5 metres and 8.4 metres for a short section of one elevation. Length reduced by 2.4 metres and width reduced by 1.2 metres. The layout optimises the site's solar orientation.
- Response from the applicant's archaeological consultant provided who considers the dwelling vernacular but not a particularly good example of a style of anything other than a basic two up two down solution for a domestic home in a time of poverty.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None

6.3. Observations

Duileach and Kay Ryan submitted an observation outlining their circumstances, concerns with the revised design in terms of scale, loss of light and loss of privacy and unsatisfactory responses to the further information request.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, after an inspection of the site, and having regard to relevant local, regional and national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues to be considered in this appeal are as follows:

- Built Vernacular Heritage
- Design & Visual Impact
- Residential Amenity
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening
- Material Contravention

7.2. Having inspected the site, I consider that the subject dwelling is habitable and not in a ruinous or derelict condition. As the appeal relates to a replacement dwelling, the requirement to demonstrate rural housing need does not apply in accordance with paragraph 5.11.2 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP).

Built Vernacular Heritage

7.3. I note the PA's primary reason for refusal was that they considered the dwelling proposed to be demolished to be of vernacular importance and a characteristic feature of the area which contributes positively to local distinctiveness and placemaking.

7.4. I note the Applicant's response, in particular the response from the Applicant's consultant archaeologist, who considers that although the structure is vernacular it is not a good example and is of poor quality construction with unsympathetic later modifications.

- 7.5. I note that the building is not a protected structure or listed on the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH). I also note that the building is not on the first edition 6 inch map or the 25 inch map and the site formerly consisted of a clachan type development, as described by the Applicant's archaeologist. The PA's archaeologist describes that the building was established by the congested district board (CDB).
- 7.6. Whilst I appreciate the arguments of the Applicant's planning consultant and archaeologist, it is my view that the two storey, three bay, gable ended house represents a vernacular structure, and although not a protected structure or on the NIAH, it contributes to the unique local history of the area and to the character and sense of place. I consider that its demolition would be seriously detrimental to the built vernacular heritage and visual amenities of the area and would not be in accordance with the provisions of the CDP, NPO17 of the NPF or national guidance in relation to vernacular structures.
- 7.7. I note the arguments in relation to the building condition, however, it is my view that these conditions can be adequately addressed and the property can be successfully rehabilitated to a high energy rating.
- 7.8. Furthermore, the Board should note that the Climate Action Plan 2023 recognises that as traditional buildings represent a significant resource of 'sunk' or embodied carbon, their retention and reuse will be critical to avoiding unnecessary emissions associated with demolition and replacement. I consider that to permit the proposed demolition would not be in accordance with the Climate Action Plan in this regard. The Board should note that public consultation on the Climate Action Plan 2024 will commence in early 2024.

Design & Visual Impact

- 7.9. I note that the PA's second reason for refusal was in relation to concerns regarding the excessive scale and massing of the proposed replacement dwelling on an elevated and sensitive coastal location and in an area of high landscape value that would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area. I note the third party observation that also raises concern with the scale and massing of the proposed development.
- 7.10. I note that the existing dwelling measures 160.5 sqm and the proposed development will measure c. 298sqm, following a reduction of 100sqm at further information stage.

The design proposed is linear in nature with a kink on the north west elevation. I note the depth and length of the proposed dwelling.

- 7.11. Having regard to the photomontages and having inspected the site, it is my view that the existing building on site has a significant visual impact on the wider landscape and scenic route S75. However, I consider this to be a positive impact having regard to its vernacular nature (as assessed above).
- 7.12. I consider that the existing dwelling onsite is more visible than that of the proposed design. The replacement dwelling is proposed to be built into the topography of the site and will have a ridge height of 6.2 metres which I note will be below the ridge height of the existing dwelling. I note that the gable on the north west elevation will be prominently viewed from the scenic route S75 and will appear to be two storey to a ridge height of 8.45 metres. The proposed external finishes will comprise of dark grey metal cladding to the walls and roof with aluminium clad timber windows which I consider represent contemporary finishes and which will help lessen the visual impact.
- 7.13. Overall, I do not consider that the proposed development in terms of scale, form and massing would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area including the views from the scenic route S75.

Residential Amenity

- 7.14. I note the observation from the occupants of the adjoining dwelling to the north of the site. I noted on the date of my site inspection that there are substantial level differences between the ground level of the Observer's dwelling and the subject site.

Overlooking

- 7.15. The potential areas that overlooking may occur from is the proposed studio, lounge area and terrace. I noted on my site inspection that the Observer's dwelling is built right up to their rear boundary and together with the level differences and existing vegetation it was difficult to have direct views into the rooms of this property or their garden. Having regard to this and to the proposed set back, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not result in an adverse impact in terms of overlooking.

Overshadowing/Loss of Light

- 7.16. I note that the existing dwelling is set back approximately 22 metres from the Observer's dwelling. The proposed development will be set back approximately 15

metres. Whilst I note that the proposed ridge height is lower than the existing level, the proposed ridge height will be approximately 6 metres closer to the Observer's dwelling.

- 7.17. I note the existing house and its location to the south of the Observer's dwelling. I note the shadow diagrams submitted illustrating the existing dwelling to the north and the subject site. The PA do not appear to have undertaken an assessment of these diagrams. Based on the separation and presence of the existing house, I am satisfied that no significant effect should occur from the proposed development on the Observer's property in terms of overshadowing.
- 7.18. However, having regard to the BRE Guidelines, it is unclear from the submitted diagrams whether there will be any significant loss of light to the habitable rooms of the Observer's dwelling to the north. Therefore, there remains some uncertainty which the Board may wish to pursue further in the event of a decision to grant permission, however, given the fundamental reason for refusal identified below this is not recommended as a reason for refusal.

Other Issues

- 7.19. I note that the existing dwelling is served by a septic tank and it is proposed to provide a tertiary wastewater treatment system and percolation area as part of the proposed development. A site characterisation form was submitted with the application which was assessed by the PA. I note that the PA had a number of issues in relation to the assessment. It appears that the Applicant did not clarify the percolation results, separation distances or trial hole location and the PA's Area Engineer sought clarification of further information. It is not clear whether there are adequate separation distances to a ditch/watercourse to the north of the site which I note was raised by the Appellant in their submission to the PA. I note that this ditch/watercourse was not identified on the submitted plans. Having regard to the nature of the development, which seeks to upgrade an existing septic tank system onsite, I am satisfied that these issues can be satisfactorily addressed. However, the Board may wish to pursue this matter further in the event of a decision to grant permission.
- 7.20. With regards to the observation in relation to the track and boundary treatment to the north, the Observer should note that the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land. Any further consents that may have to be obtained are essentially a subsequent

matter, and are outside the scope of the planning appeal. In any case, this is a matter to be resolved between the relevant parties, having regard to the provisions of Section 34(13) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening

- 7.21. The subject site is not located within any European Site. The site is located approximately 200 metres north of the Galley Head to Duneen Point Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004190). The qualifying interests of the 004190 SPA is the Chough (*Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax*) [A346] where the conservation objective is to maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of this bird species.
- 7.22. There are no hydrological links to this SPA within the subject site, however, there is a ditch/watercourse to the north of the site, on the northern side of the existing track, which hydrologically connects to a watercourse to the northwest of the site, which connects to the SPA.
- 7.23. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, to the existing use on the site and separation from the European Site, I consider that the proposed development, individually or in-combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA, or any other European Site, in view of the said sites' conservation objectives. An appropriate assessment is not, therefore, required.

Material Contravention

- 7.24. I note that the PA's reasons for refusal state that the proposed development would materially contravene objectives HE 16-19, PL 3-5, RP 5-22 and GI 14-9 of the CDP and thus materially contravene the CDP. Having regard to the general nature and text of these objectives, I am satisfied that a material contravention does not arise in this instance. Notwithstanding this conclusion, I have assessed the development against the four criteria outlined under Section 37(2)(b) of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, which is the criteria that allows the Board to grant permission in the event of a material contravention:

1. The proposed development is of strategic or national importance

I consider that the proposed development is not of strategic or national importance.

2. There are conflicting objectives in the development plan or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned

I consider that there are no conflicting objectives or unclear objectives in the CDP, as the proposed development is concerned.

3. Permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to regional spatial and economic strategy for the area, guidelines under section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the Government, the Minister or any Minister of the Government

Having regard to these policy, objectives and guidelines documentation, and to the nature of the development, I consider that there are no relevant criteria that would permit a material contravention of the CDP.

4. Permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan

The CDP was adopted in 2022 and having regard to the pattern of development in the area, I note that there are no permissions granted in the area for the demolition and replacement of vernacular structures.

8.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission should be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the habitable condition and vernacular nature of the existing dwelling proposed to be demolished, which positively contributes to the character of the area and to the sense of place, it is considered that to permit its demolition would be seriously detrimental to the built vernacular heritage and visual amenity of the area and would contravene objectives PL 3-5, HE16-9 and HE-16-20 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. Additionally, the proposed development would be contrary to the provisions of the Climate

Action Plan 2023, as updated, which seeks to retain and reuse traditional buildings to avoid unnecessary emissions associated with demolition and replacement. It is considered, therefore, that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Gary Farrelly
Planning Inspector

23rd January 2024

Appendix 1

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

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	317910			
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of dwelling and construction of single dwelling and wastewater treatment unit			
Development Address	Dunowen, Ardfield, Co. Cork			
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)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	No	No further action required		
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	<input type="checkbox"/>		EIA Mandatory EIAR required	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		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	<input type="checkbox"/>			No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units Class 15 Any project listed in this Part which does not exceed a quantity, area or other limit specified in this Part in respect of the relevant class of development but which would be likely to have 	Development is for a single dwelling unit.	Proceed to Q.4

		significant effects on the environment, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7.		
--	--	--	--	--

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	317910	
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of dwelling and construction of single dwelling and wastewater treatment unit	
Development Address	Dunowen, Ardfield, Co. Cork	
<p>The Board carries out a preliminary examination [Ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)] of, at least, the nature, size or location of the proposed development having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
Nature of the Development Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment? Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?	The development is for a single dwellinghouse within a rural area. Localised construction and demolition impacts expected, topsoil removal, c&d waste etc.	No
Size of the Development Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?	The development site measures 0.137 hectares. The size of the development is not exceptional in the context of the existing environment. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects with existing and permitted projects in the area.	No

Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects?		
Location of the Development Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location? Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?	The subject site is not located within any designated site. The nearest designated sites are the Galley Head to Duneen Point Special Protection Area (SPA) (Site Code 004190), which is located approximately 200 metres south of the subject site, and the Dirk Bay proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA), which is located approximately 300 metres west of the subject site.	No
Conclusion		
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. EIA not required.	There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment. Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. EIA required.

Inspector: _____

Date: _____