



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-318721-23

Development	The widening and lengthening of existing internal farm roadway served by existing farm entrance together with all associated site works
Location	Knockanes, Adare, Co. Limerick
Planning Authority	Limerick City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2360739
Applicant(s)	Tizzard Holdings Unlimited Company
Type of Application	Retention permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant retention
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Breda Mann and Michael Mann
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	26 February 2024
Inspector	Claire McVeigh

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site, 0.48ha, is located in the townland of Knockanes to the east of Adare Manor Hotel and Golf Club. The existing vehicular access off the L1420 comprises a double gateway and directly adjoins another double gateway to the appellant's lands. There are existing detached dwellings along the L1420 which back onto the northeastern and northern boundaries of the site. The adjoining lands to the south are in agricultural use.
- 1.2. There are three agricultural fields, delineated by internal hedgerows, to which the northern edge of the roadway runs adjacent and along the southern boundary of the roadway is a timber post and fence shared boundary. The laneway terminates at a post and rail fence at the western boundary of the subject site, within approximately 100 metres from a double gated vehicular entrance into Adare Manor Hotel and Golf Course in the stone wall leading from the adjacent agricultural field.
- 1.3. I note that the overall landholding map L01 illustrates that total landownership including the Adare Manor, as outlined in blue.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention of the widening and lengthening of existing internal farm roadway served by existing farm entrance together with all associated site works.
- 2.2. The application drawing number 23-001-001 indicates a proposed set back of a portion of hedge to provide improved sightlines at the entrance. For clarity I note that the subject boundary hedgerow is not included within the application red line boundary and not within the landownership of the applicant. A letter of consent has been provided from Breda O'Keefe property owner of the dwelling immediately south of the appellant's entrance.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority decided to grant retention permission on the 28 November 2023 subject to 4 no. conditions (see section 3.2.3)

- Condition no. 2 - The vehicular entrance shall be used for agricultural purposes only and shall not be used for any residential or commercial purposes.
- Condition no. 4 - All surface water run-off from the roofs, entrances and parking areas within the site shall be collected and disposed of within the site to soakpits/adjacent watercourse. No such surface waters shall discharge onto adjoining properties or the public road.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Previous planning application (22/1068) seeking retention permission for the widening and lengthening of the existing internal farm roadway was deemed withdrawn as no response was received following further information request. Further information was requested due to concerns that the road would be used as an alternative access to Adare Manor Resort. Third party objection on file notes concerns with same.
- Cover note with the application states that the road is to be retained for farm use only.
- Considers that the drawings submitted do not indicate the removal of any hedging or changes to the immediately adjacent landowner's (*the appellant*) access. In third party submission this landowner has stated that he does not agree to the removal of any hedging within his landholding.
- Letter of consent from landowner of dwelling to the southeast to allow a setback of existing roadside boundary to achieve sightlines. Notes Roads Department have reviewed and are satisfied with the proposals.
- Considers that the development should not exercise a significant effect on the conservation status of any SAC or SPA and therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not necessary.
- Preliminary EIA Examination – determined that the development is not of a type included under Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended). No screening determination required.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Roads- Planner's report notes report received 15/11/2023. No objection subject to conditions:

Surface water:

(a) Regarding the risk of surface water from the public roadway entering their site, the applicant is required to put measures in place to cater for this eventuality and must be conditioned to be liable for the management of surface water from the public roadway entering their site into the future i.e. Limerick City and County Council will not be responsible for preventing surface water from the public roadway entering the applicant's site or for carrying out any works in the future to treat this issue should it arise. This condition is to apply even following any works Limerick City and County Council for the improvement of the public road in the future.

(b) All surface water run-off from the site shall be disposed of appropriately. No such surface water shall be allowed discharge onto adjoining properties or onto the public road.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

There were two submissions made, in summary:

Conor Geaney

- The roadway was built, and the original entrance was widened in the two months preceding the JP McManus Pro-am. It was used as an entry and exit for over 1000 cars per day 6am-9pm and for about 100 heavy good vehicle movements on the 5 days around the event.
- Concerns with respect to the significant traffic hazard (there have been 3 serious traffic collisions within 50 metres of this entrance over the last 4 years) and the overlooking effect on his property.

- Request that their farm entrance is not interfered with and the runoff water from service road does not flow onto their lands.

4.0 Planning History

221068 (October 2022) Application for the retention permission for the widening and lengthening of existing internal farm roadway serviced by existing farm entrance together with all associated site works – deemed withdrawn following no response to further information request.

Further information requested in respect to:

- the proposed use of the roadway,
- information to demonstrate that sightlines and stopping sight distances of 90m can be achieved,
- a cross section of the internal road and a report from a suitably qualified Engineer which explains how the roadway has been constructed and is in accordance with the requirements set out in the Department of Agricultural Food & Marine (DAFM) S.1990 Minimum Specification for Farm Roadways (January 2021) with specific reference to attenuation of water run-off from the roadway and potential impact on waters.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1.1. Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028

The Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028 was adopted on the 22 May 2023. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect of rural and agricultural development.

- Map 6.1 Landscape Character Assessment 'Agricultural Lowlands'.
- LCA 01 Agricultural Lowlands
- 8.5.5 Storm Water and Surface Water
- Objective IN O12 Surface Water and SuDS, in particular subsections: -

(c) Maintain, improve and enhance the environmental and ecological quality of surface waters and groundwater, including reducing the discharges of pollutants or contaminants to waters, in accordance with the National River Basin Management Plan for Ireland 2018-2021 (DHPLG) and the associated Programme of Measures and any subsequent River Basin Management Plan.

(f) Address the issue of disposal of surface water generated by existing development in the area, through improvements to surface water infrastructure, including for example attenuation ponds, the application of sustainable urban drainage techniques, or by minimising the amount of hard surfaced areas, or providing porous surfaces as the opportunity arises.

(g) Protect the surface water resources of the Plan area and in individual planning applications request the provision of sediment and grease traps and pollution control measures where deemed necessary.

(h) Require all planning applications to include surface-water design calculations to establish the suitability of drainage between the site and the outfall point and require all new developments to include SuDS, to control surface water outfall and protect water quality in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 11: Development Management Standards of the Plan.

(i) Promote SuDS and grey water recycling in developments and responsible use of water by the wider community, to reduce the demand for water supply.

(j) Require SuDS schemes to be designed to incorporate the four pillars of water quality, water quantity, biodiversity and amenity to the greatest extent possible within the constraints of a given site.

- 9.2.2 Climate Adaptation and Mitigation and Land Use Planning

5.1.2. The subject site is located outside of but is in close proximity to the eastern edge of the Adare Local Area Plan 2024-2030 (in effect from 26th March 2024) LAP boundary.

Adare is a designated Architectural Conservation Area (ACA).

5.1.3. **Other documents referred to:**

S.199 Minimum Specification for Farm Roadways and Underpasses – Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine (DAFM) (March 2024).

5.2. **Natural Heritage Designations**

Lower River Shannon SAC [Site Code: 002165] is approximately 1.5km northwest of the subject site.

5.3. **EIA Screening**

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 screening determination or EIA, therefore, is not required.

6.0 **The Appeal**

6.1. **Grounds of Appeal**

Michael Mann and Breda Mann:

In summary the grounds of appeal are:

- The roadway abuts in parts their land and surface water is draining from the roadway directly into their lands. Drawing 'Typical Cross Section Through Access Road' supplied by the applicants show a road camber of 1:40. Remedial works would be required to address this issue.
- The entrance site layout plan 1 of 3 indicates sight lines are achievable in both directions with the removal of hedging from Breda O'Keefe's property. It appears that sightlines cannot be achieved without the removal of hedging from the appellant's land. No hedging should be removed from the appellant's property.

- The description of development on the statutory notices does not include a description of the proposed works to the existing entrance.

6.2. Applicant Response

- The third-party appeal fails to present any material land-use planning issue as to why the development is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The purpose of the additional section of farm roadway is to facilitate the agricultural use of the land. Highlight that the cover letter with the application states *'the applicant wishes to retain this farm for farm use only and undertakes that this will not be used as an access road connecting the L1420 to the Adare Manor Resort'*.
- Notes an error on drawing 22-033-202 'Typical Cross Section Through Access Road' submitted as part of the planning application, which indicates the roadway has a camber of 1:40 from the centre line of the roadway to the edge. A new drawing (Figure 1) has been submitted which indicates that the road surface is level with the surrounding lands without a camber.
- The road is constructed of material which allows rainwater to percolate through the road build-up as opposed to draining onto the adjoining lands to the south.
- Local temporary waterlogging was evident on farmland throughout the area during June-December 2023 due to intense and prolonged rainfall events (Mer Eireann Data records from Shannon Airport submitted). The ponding has now dissipated as the precipitation levels have returned to normal levels.
- Visibility splays are shown on drawing 23-001-001. This shows the minimum intervention to achieve the recommended sightline. The image on p. 5 of the appellant's submission shows the 2.4m step back directly outside the entrance to the appellants lands. The sight lines at this point are more restricted than the sightlines from the entrance to the applicant's lands.
- While no intensification of vehicular movements at the existing agricultural entrance arises, the application proposes to improve sight lines at the

entrance in response to the planning authority's request. The visibility splay required to achieve 90m sightline is shown on drawing no. P01. This will require a portion of hedgerow to the property to the southwest to be set back to provide the required sightline. Letter of consent from the property owner, Breda O'Keefe, is included with the application.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- None.

6.4. Observations

- None.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. I highlight to the Board that there are discrepancies in the submitted application and applicant's appeal response comments, as listed:

- The scale of the drawings referred to on the architects cover letter dated the 4 October 2023 do not correspond with the scale annotated on the submitted drawings. When scaling from the drawing on the digital case file it appears that the stated scale on the drawing is correct.
- I note that the applicant's response to the appeal states that the total length of farm roadway is 43 metres approx. and the additional section of widened farm roadway, by 1 m, comprises a length of 14.1 metres. These figures are incorrect when comparing with the submitted drawings. For clarity, the total length of the farm roadway to be retained is shown to be approximately 560m. Of this total the extended roadway is approximately 295 m in length x 6 metre in width. The length of existing roadway shown to be widened by 1m is approximately 265m.
- In the submitted applicant's response the supporting document by EOB Management Services states in respect to sight distances that 'Visibility splays are shown on drawing 23-001-001 this shows the minimum intervention to achieve the recommended sightline'. I note for the Board that

this drawing is not included in the documentation submitted in response nor is it included in the digital case. (Please refer to 7.5 of this report)

7.2. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local, regional, national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Surface-water
- Sightlines
- Miscellaneous issues

7.3. *Principle of development*

- 7.3.1. The subject site is located within the designated rural landscape character area 'Agricultural Lowlands' (LCA 01) and the site runs adjacent to three large agricultural fields separated by hedgerow boundaries. Chapter 6 of the development plan outlines that the LAC 01-character area is a farming landscape and is defined by a series of regular field boundaries, often allowed to grow to maturity and the pastoral nature of the landscape is reinforced by the presence of farmyards.
- 7.3.2. According to the documentation on file an existing agricultural roadway has been extended along the full extent of the southern boundary of the site (approximately 560m in length) and widened to now comprise a 6 metres carriageway for its full length. There is a large area of hardstanding at the entrance of the gateway. From the information available on file, I am unable to determine the extent of field boundary removal undertaken, if any to carry out the roadway works.
- 7.3.3. In their response to the appeal the applicant's state that the purpose of the widened roadway and extension of same is to facilitate the agricultural use of the three fields at the eastern section of the Adare Manor resort landholding, which sits to the east of the 12th fairway on the golf course. I note also the statement within the planning application cover letter which states '*the applicant wishes to retain this farm road for farm use only and undertakes that this will not be used as an access road connecting the L1420 to the Adare Manor Resort.*' The applicant's response to the

appeal clarifies that there is no intensification of vehicular movements at the existing agricultural entrance. It is set out that the proposed improvements to the sightlines at the entrance are in response to a request from the planning authority. I note for the Board that there is no written report from the planning authority to verify this statement.

I note that the engineer's cover letter submitted with the application states that the 'layout of the roadway as constructed is in substantial compliance with the requirements of Section 5 of *S.199- New Farm Roadway Construction*'. No further detail is supplied on file to demonstrate stated compliance with same or detail provided with respect to the numbers of livestock in herd using the roadway (Section 4.4 Table 2 of S.199 provides guidance on the farm roadway width for various herd sizes i.e. herd size - 200 roadway width (4.5m)), numbers of vehicle movements and types of vehicles. As such, I consider that the application documentation and the applicant's response to the appeal does not include a sufficient justification for the need of a roadway of such an excessive width and scale, solely for existing agricultural purposes serving only three fields with no farmyard or farm buildings, within the open unzoned landscape of this designated 'Agricultural Lowlands' area of Limerick. The scale and extent of works at this location have not been justified and would, therefore, constitute haphazard development and would not be acceptable in principle. The proposed development to be retained would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I shall now assess the proposed retention application against the other substantive issues (section 7.4-7.6).

7.4. *Surface-water*

- 7.4.1. The development sought to be retained comprises the widening of an existing agricultural roadway by 1 metre in width for a length of 265m and the extension of the roadway into the landholding by 295m. The appellant's have raised concerns that water from the roadway is draining onto their property and suggest that remedial works would be required to address this issue. From my site inspection I note that the appellant's land had some areas of water ponding, poached ground with vehicle rutting within the southeastern section of the lands and rush growth evident in the western section. Within the application site there was some water lying in a channel

running alongside the northwestern edge of the widened roadway section abutting the agricultural field (within the applicant's ownership).

- 7.4.2. No details have been submitted with respect to the ground condition, the soil type or any additional surface water management proposals with exception to the applicant's engineers cover letter which states that the '*layout of the roadway as constructed is in substantial compliance with the requirements of Section 5 of S.199- New Farm Roadway Construction...the roadway has been configured to avoid any direct runoff to waters*'. The appellant's highlight that the cross-section drawing (Typical Road Section Drawing no. 22-033-202) shows a road camber of 1:40 and state that the road is above or level with the appellant's lands so water in draining onto their property. In response the applicants have submitted a revised cross section (Figure 1, Page 1) through the access road without any camber.
- 7.4.3. I note that the minimum specification set out in DAFM's S.199 section 4.3 states that to remove water quickly from the roadway they should slope to one or both sides, with a note clarifying that a roadway that slopes to both sides from the centre is not to be adopted where compliance with the regulations preventing direct runoff of soiled water to waters is concerned.
- 7.4.4. I note that there are discrepancies in the submitted information on file and in the applicant's response to the appeal they have acknowledged an 'inadvertent error' was made on drawing no. 22-033-202 with respect to whether the roadway has a camber or not. Notwithstanding these stated errors from my site inspection, and from the submitted information on file, I observed that there is a road build up and the roadway graduates to the edges. I am of the opinion that sufficient information has not been provided, with respect to the as built roadway design, surface water design calculations and details in respect to the surface water management of same, in accordance with the requirements set out under Objective INO12 of the development plan to determine whether the surface water is managed in a manner such that it shall be collected and disposed of within the site and does not discharge onto adjoining properties.

Furthermore, it is considered that insufficient details have been provided to determine whether it would be possible to dispose of the surface water in a manner that will achieve the control of run-off quantity and quality while enhancing amenity

and habitat contrary to Objective IN O12 Surface Water and SuDS of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7.5. *Sightlines*

- 7.5.1. The applicant in their response to the appeal state that it is proposed to improve sightlines at the entrance in response to the planning authority's request. I note a letter of consent has been provided from Breda O'Keefe property owner of the dwelling immediately south of the appellant's entrance. This property shares the northwestern boundary of their property with the appellant.
- 7.5.2. The planners report considered that 'the drawings submitted do not indicate the removal of any hedging or changes to his (*the appellants*) access'. Drawing no. P01 illustrates a 90-metre sightline in blue with a portion of hedge to be set back coloured in yellow. The applicant's response to appeal states that drawing no. 23-001-001 shows the minimum intervention to achieve the recommended sightline. For clarity, this drawing is not included in the applicant's response submission or the application documentation.
- 7.5.3. The appellants raise the question of ownership in respect to the hedge and, therefore, the lack of their consent for the proposed removal of a portion of that hedge. The appellant has submitted a copy of folio map indicating their ownership of the immediately adjoining land south of the subject site. From the information submitted by both the appellant and the applicant it is unclear as to how much, if any, of the appellants hedgerow would be required to be removed. This is, however, a civil matter to be resolved between the parties, having regard to the provisions of s.34 (13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.
- 7.5.4. The subject boundary hedgerow is not included within the application red line boundary and not within the landownership of the applicant, as outlined in blue on the submitted site location map. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the works indicated on the drawing P01 within respect to the set back of the hedgerow do not form part of the application and, therefore, do not form part of my assessment. I note for the Board that no additional movements are stated as arising from this development.

7.5.5. In the event that the Board is minded to grant retention permission for the widening and lengthening of the internal farm roadway this issue could be addressed by way of an advisory note clarifying that the works shown outside of the red line do not form part of the planning application.

7.6. *Miscellaneous Issues*

7.6.1. The appellant highlights that condition no. 2 relates to the vehicular entrance and is of the view that if the entrance formed part of the application, it should have been clear in the application and public notices.

7.6.2. I note that the public notices do refer to the existing farm entrance and the existing entrance is included within the application red line boundary. As such, I consider that the imposition of a condition limiting the use of the vehicular entrance to agricultural purposes only as appropriate and provides clarity of the permitted use in light of third-party observations received.

7.6.3. In the event that the Board is minded to grant retention permission a similar condition to condition no. 2 could be attached.

8.0 **AA Screening**

I have considered the proposed development to be retained in light of the requirements of S177U the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is the Lower River Shannon SAC [Site Code: 002165], 1.5 kms northwest of the subject site. Within the main estuarine complex are several tributaries with their own sub-estuaries and this includes the Mague River which is located west of the subject site, flowing through the grounds of Adare Manor. A tributary of the Mague River is approximately 170m south of the subject site.

The proposed development to be retained is located within a rural area and the works to be retained comprise the widening and lengthening of an existing internal farm roadway.

A screening report for Appropriate Assessment was not submitted with this planning appeal case. However, in the planning authority assessment of the proposed

development, Appropriate Assessment Screening was undertaken by Limerick City and County Council as part of their planning assessment and a finding of no likely significant effects on a European Site was determined. Limerick City and County Council concluded the proposed development would not require the preparation of a Natura Impact Statement and Appropriate Assessment was not carried out.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development to be retained I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any appreciable effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the development.
- The distance from European Sites and absence of direct ecological pathways to any European Site.

I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that RETENTION permission for the development be refused for the following reasons and considerations:

10.0 Reasons and Consideration

1. It is considered that sufficient information has not been provided with respect to the 'as built' roadway design, surface water design calculations and surface water management of same to demonstrate that the surface water would be managed such that it shall be collected and disposed of within the site and would not discharge onto adjoining properties. Furthermore, it is considered that insufficient details have been provided to determine whether it would be possible to dispose of the surface water in a manner that will achieve the control of run-off quantity and quality while enhancing amenity and habitat contrary to Objective IN O12 Surface Water and SuDS of the Limerick Development Plan 2022-2028. The proposed development

would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. It is considered that the application documentation and the applicant's response to the appeal does not include a sufficient justification for the need of a roadway of such an excessive width and scale, solely for existing agricultural purposes serving only three fields with no farmyard or farm buildings, within the open unzoned landscape of this designated 'Agricultural Lowlands' area of Limerick. The scale and extent of works at this location have not been justified and would, therefore, constitute haphazard development and would not be acceptable in principle. The proposed development to be retained would, therefore, 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.

Claire McVeigh
Planning Inspector

29 August 2024

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	318721-23		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention permission for the widening and lengthening of existing internal farm roadway served by existing farm entrance together with all associated site works.		
Development Address	Knockanes, Adare, Co. Limerick.		
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	√
		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	√		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)
No			
Yes	√	Class 10 (dd) All private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length.	Proceed to Q4.

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	√	Preliminary Examination required
Yes		Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	318721-23	
Proposed Development Summary	Retention permission for the widening and lengthening of existing internal farm roadway served by existing farm entrance together with all associated site works.	
Development Address	Knockanes, Adare, Co. Limerick.	
<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> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>		
	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
<p>Nature of the Development</p> <p>Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</p>	<p>The development is for the retention of a widening and lengthened existing internal farm roadway service by the existing farm entrance together with site works.</p> <p>The roadway is approximately a total of 560 metres in length and over 6 metres in width comprising a road build up of capping layer, sub-base and unbound gravel surface course.</p> <p>No significant waste, emissions or pollutants are likely.</p>	No
<p>Size of the Development</p> <p>Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</p> <p>Are there significant cumulative</p>	<p>The roadway sought to be retained is of a width and scale that equates to the carriageway width for an arterial street (as per figure 4.55 of the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets). Issues relating to the scale of the roadway addressed in 7.3 of my report.</p> <p>However, I note that the size of the proposed development is below the mandatory thresholds in</p>	No

considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects?	<p>respect of the threshold under Class 10 (dd) All private roads which would exceed 2000 metres in length - Infrastructure Projects of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended.</p> <p>There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and/or permitted projects in the adjoining area.</p>	
<p>Location of the Development</p> <p>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location?</p> <p>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area?</p>	<p>The subject site is not located within or adjacent to any European Site. The closest European Site, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is the Lower River Shannon SAC Lower River Shannon SAC [Site Code: 002165], 1.5 kms northwest of the subject site. Within the main estuarine complex are several tributaries with their own sub-estuaries and this includes the Mague River which is located west of the subject site, flowing through the grounds of Adare Manor.</p> <p>With respect the test of likely significant effect for EIA purposes I consider that the development to be retained would not be of such significance to require EIA.</p> <p>It is considered that, having regard to the nature and scale of the development, there is no real likelihood of significant effect on other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p>	
Conclusion		
<p>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment in terms of the nature, size and location of the proposed development and having specific regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the P&D Regs 2001 (as amended).</p> <p>EIA not required.</p>		

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)