



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-318990-24

#### Development

Demolition of existing two storey dwelling and garage. Construction of 3 no. two storey dwellings. Vehicular entrance and maintain existing vehicular entrances together with all associated site works.

#### Location

Beaupre, Mount Ovel, Rochestown, Mounthovel (Townland), Cork

#### Planning Authority

Cork City Council

#### Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

2342447

#### Applicant(s)

Izara Mosby

#### Type of Application

Permission

#### Planning Authority Decision

Refusal

#### Type of Appeal

First Party

#### Appellant(s)

Izara Mosby

#### Observer(s)

None

#### Date of Site Inspection

6<sup>th</sup> June 2024

**Inspector**

Frank O'Donnell

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject appeal site is located at the intersection of the Rochestown Road (R610) Regional Road and Mount Ovel Road on the eastern side of the N28 (National Secondary Road), approximately 4.93 km to the southeast of the centre of Cork City. The site has a stated area of 0.115 hectares (1,150 sqm), has a general rectangular shape and comprises an existing one and a half storey detached dormer dwelling, an attached single storey garage structure and associated front, side and rear garden space. There are 2 no. existing vehicular entrances on the onto the public road along the western site boundary. The northern and western site boundaries are defined by an existing high natural stone wall. The site falls in a general south to north direction.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises the following:
- Permission for:
    - The demolition of an existing two storey detached dwelling and garage.
    - The construction of 3 no. two storey dwellings.
    - New vehicular entrance and to maintain the 2 no. existing vehicular entrances.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. The Local Planning Authority issued a decision to REFUSE planning permission on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2024 for the following reason:

1. *It is considered that the proposed development is premature pending the determination of TII and the Local Authority of the proposed junction layout and upgrade works to St Patrick's roundabout in connection with the design review for the M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy road project and the Rochestown to Douglas Active Travel Scheme. 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

- The **Local Authority Planner** considers that the proposed development is premature as future design layouts for the proposed M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy M28 road upgrade and Rochestown to Douglas Active Travel Scheme at St. Partick's Roundabout are yet to be completed. These matters, the Planner considers, cannot be further address by the applicant in this application.
- The **Local Authority Senior Executive Planner** recommends that permission be refused.

#### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- The **Drainage Division** recommend that a Request for Further Information be issued on 2 no. main points relating to:
  - Revised site drainage proposals/ full details of the proposed storm water drainage details, including discharge location. Proposals to manage storm water on site in order to limit discharge to the equivalent greenfield runoff rate, or 2l/sec/ha (whichever is the greater) for the developed area within the site for the 1-in-100-year (1% AEP) rainfall event with allowance for climate change. (including drawings and calculations).
  - Details of a New Connection agreement with Uisce Eireann or a Confirmation of Feasibility. If it is proposed to discharge storm water to the existing foul sewer, this shall be explicitly stated in the Connection Agreement or Confirmation of Feasibility received from Uisce Eireann.
- The **Environment Department** raised no objection to the proposed development subject to 3 no. standard conditions.
- The **Housing & Community Directorate** raised no objection to the proposed development.

- The **Area Engineer** recommends that a Request for Further Information be issued on the following main points:
  - Provide agreement from Cork County Council Design Office Glanmire, M28 Team that this proposal is acceptable to them.
  - Provide a drawing showing a max achievable sight distance from new proposed entrance.
  - Provide detailed drawing showing extended footpath in front of the 3 properties, and in this drawing please show p-proposed movement of existing and additional gullies.
- The **Infrastructure Development Directorate** recommend that Permission be REFUSED due to it being premature considering the major projects taking place adjacent to the site. The following main points are made in the assessment:
  - *The proposed development site is located on the southern side of the Rochestown Road on the Mount Ovel Road to the southeast corner of the St. Patrick's Roundabout.*
  - *The M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Project is the upgrade of approximately 12.5km of the N28 National Primary Route from the N40 South Ring Road, at Bloomfield Interchange, to Ringaskiddy, Co. Cork. The planning application for the M28 scheme was granted by ABP in 2018 and the decision was cleared of any legal challenges in 2021. The CPO that was granted for the scheme has lands being acquired on three sides of the proposed development site. TII have undertaken a review of the design that was approved for planning for the M28 scheme and have identified St. Patrick's Roundabout as an area where further design development is required. TII are currently undertaking that review to determine what changes may be required.*
  - *In addition to the M28 Scheme, Cork City council is progressing the Rochestown to Douglas Active Travel Scheme which travels along the R610 Rochestown Road that the M28 scheme is proposing to carry out. Design work on the Rochestown to Douglas Active Travel Scheme*

*through St. Patrick's Roundabout is subject to the TII design review to finalise the design in that location.*

- *Based on the above, and having consulted with the TII NRDO Cork, I recommend that the planning application is refused until there is more certainty with regard to the proposed nearby infrastructure projects previously mentioned.*

### **3.3. Prescribed Bodies**

- Uisce Eireann (Irish Water): No objection to the proposed development subject to 3 no. standard observations.

### **3.4. Third Party Observations**

- 2 no. Third Party Observations were received from the following:
  - Anne O'Neill Leneghan
  - Jackie O'Donnell
- The main issues raised in the Observation from Anne O'Neill Leneghan are as follows:
  - The development description refers to two storey dwellings whereas the proposals are for dormer dwellings. The proposed development is therefore not described correctly.
  - The Observers property adjoins the proposed development site 2 and 3. In particular, proposed new dwelling no. 3 will obstruct views, skyline views and the availability of sunlight.
  - The proposal will result in overlooking of the Observers property, garden and driveway. A similar impact upon the Observers property will arise as a result of the development site no. 2.
  - There is no reference/ provision in the planning notices for the screening trees on the boundary wall at the rear of each of the proposed properties but there is provision at the roadside boundary.

- The development description refers to two storey dwellings whereas the proposals are for dormer dwellings. The proposed development is therefore not described correctly.
- The Observers property adjoins the proposed development site 2 and 3. In particular, proposed new dwelling no. 3 will obstruct views, skyline views and the availability of sunlight.
- The main issues raised in the Observation from Jackie O'Donnell are as follows:
  - The site directly backs on to our property.
  - We request that every effort is made to retain the existing trees that border both properties as they act as a sound barrier between the Observer's property and the Motorway.

## 4.0 Planning History

### 4.1. On the subject site

- **10/5466:** Permission for demolition of existing garage and extension to dwelling. Permission was GRANTED on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2010 subject to 9 no. conditions.
- **15/5744:** Extension of Duration of Planning Reg. Ref. no. 10/5466. EOD GRANTED on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2015. The Notification of Decision dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2015 states *'this permission will now cease to have effect on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2020.'*

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

#### **Cork City Development Plan, 2022 to 2028**

- 5.1.1. The Appeal site is zoned ZO 01 - 'Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods' in the Cork City Council Development Plan, 2022 to 2028. The relevant zoning objective for

ZO 01 lands is *'To protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.'*

5.1.2. The defined development boundary for the M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Road Project is shown on the zoning map.

5.1.3. Chapter 4 of the Plan relates to Transport and Mobility and includes the following Strategic Objective:

- Strategic Objective 3: Transport and Mobility

*'To support the implementation of the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS).*

*To support international, national and regional connectivity by supporting the operation and development of Cork Airport and the relocation of the Port of Cork to Cork Harbour.*

*To integrate land-use and transportation planning to improve movement for all across Cork City. To protect, improve and maintain the operation of national and strategic regional transport networks and assets. To promote and prioritise sustainable transport including active travel (walking and cycling) and public transport; housing and employment development will be prioritised in locations where it can be served by walking, cycling and public transport. Cork City Council will support the delivery of multimodal travel integration, smart mobility and transport networks and services that are accessible for all.*

*Proposals for new development in Cork City will be required to minimise the need for the private car, prioritise walking, cycling and public transport, be permeable, safe and secure for walking and cycling and where possible provide for filtered permeability. New developments will provide infrastructure for Electric Vehicles within the developments. Development proposals will provide for easy access to local amenities and education facilities.*

*Proposals for new development will be required to demonstrate their impact on the existing transport networks, commensurate with the nature and scale of the development. Mobility management plans will be required for developments that will accommodate a large number of people living, working or otherwise using the development.*



*All new development proposals will be subject to maximum car parking standards to achieve greater modal shift and promote sustainable transport patterns. In locations where the highest intensity of development occurs, Cork City Council may consider an approach that caps car parking on an area wide basis by means of Area Based Transport Assessments (ABTAs).*

*The delivery of the key transport projects in CMATS will be supported by land use policies and the phasing of development which is compatible with those in CMATS' land use outcome.'*

5.1.4. Chapter 4 of the Plan also includes the following Objectives:

- Objective 4.1: Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy (CMATS):
  - *Cork City Council will work in cooperation with the NTA, TII and Cork County Council to fully implement the Cork Metropolitan Area Transport Strategy subject to detailed engineering design and environmental considerations, including the projects and programmes in relation to walking, cycling, public transport, Bus Connects, suburban rail, light rail, park and rides and roads infrastructure, including the Northern Distributor Road and Southern Distributor Link Road.*
- Objective 4.4: Active Travel
- Objective 4.6: Corridor & Route Selection Process
  - *'Policies and Objectives relating to new roads and other transport infrastructure projects (including greenways, walkways, cycleways and blueways) that are not already provided for by existing plans/ programmes or are not already permitted, are subject to the undertaking of feasibility assessment having regard to normal planning considerations and environmental sensitivities as identified in the SEA Environmental Report and the objectives of the Plan relating to sustainable mobility.'*
- Objective 4.7: Protection of National Roads
  - *'To protect the strategic transport function of national roads, including motorways through the implementation of the 'Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities' DECLG, (2012)*

*and the Trans-European Networks (TEN-T) Regulations. No new accesses will be permitted where a speed limit greater than 50-60 kph applies. For existing developments with current access outside the defined speed limits, proposals for expansion of same must be accompanied by a Traffic and Transportation impact assessment. Proposals for new developments and intensification of existing developments within speed control zones must also be accompanied by a Traffic and Transportation assessment.'*

- Objective 4.8: Mitigation of Adverse Impacts on Strategic Roads
  - *'To safeguard the carrying capacity, operational efficiency and safety of strategic national roads and to require development proposals that would materially impact the capacity of the strategic national road network to mitigate any adverse effects of their development on transport systems and/or infrastructure and make reasonable contributions towards the costs of any required mitigation, alterations or capacity enhancement works to transport systems and/or infrastructure as required.'*

5.1.5. Chapter 11 of the Plan relates to Place Making and Managing Development and includes the following Objectives:

- Objective 11.1: Sustainable Residential Development
- Objective 11.3: Housing Quality and Standards
- Objective 11.4: Daylight sunlight and Overshadowing (DSO)
- Objective 11.5: Private Amenity Space

5.1.6. Other relevant Sections within Chapter 11 include the following:

- Residential Development: See Sections 11.61 & 11.62
- Sustainable Neighbourhoods: See Sections 11.64 & 11.65
- New Residential Development:
  - Placemaking and Quality Design: See Section 11.66
  - Design Quality: See Section 11.67

- Site Features and Context: See Section 11.68
- Residential Density: See Sections 11.69 to 11.73
- Quantitative Standards for all Residential Development
  - Residential Mix: See Section 11.74
  - Design Quality: See Section 11.75
- Housing Quality Standards
  - Housing Quality Standards: See Sections 11.87 to 11.89
- Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing (DSO)
  - Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing: See Sections 11.95 to 11.99
- Separation, Overlooking and Overbearance
  - Separation, Overlooking and Overbearance: See Sections 11.100 to 11.105
- Qualitative Standards for Houses
  - Qualitative Standards for Houses: See Sections 11.106 to 11.111
- Car & Bicycle Parking
  - Car & Bicycle Parking: See Sections 11.234, Zone 3: Section 11.237 & Table 11.13: Maximum Car Parking Standards
- Surface Water
  - Surface Water: See Section 11.260
- Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)
  - Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS): See Section 11.261

## **5.2. Natural Heritage Designations**

- 5.2.1. The site is not located within or adjacent to a Natura 2000 site. The nearest Natura 2000 sites are as follows:
- Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA) located c. 0.2 km to the northeast.

### **5.3. EIA Screening**

- 5.3.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed, the site location within an established built-up urban area and outside of any protected site or heritage designation, the nature of the receiving environment, the existing pattern of development in the vicinity, and the separation distance from the nearest sensitive location, there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

- 6.1.1. The Grounds of Appeal can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed development can proceed without impacting upon the proposed road alterations. Reference is made to the existing aerial view provided versus the proposed road alterations drawing presented. The Appellant considers that it can be clearly observed that the revised road alterations can take place without impacting on the perimeter of the site.
- The existing property and the value of the subject site will be negatively impacted upon by a refusal for development.
- The proposed revised roadworks (which seek to replace an existing roundabout with a signalised junction) will result in significant traffic impacts on local residents in terms of increased traffic congestion, awkward arrangement, traffic noise impacts, air quality impacts/ impact to quality of life/ health impacts, mental health impacts arising from noise pollution.
- The Planning Authority granted pre-planning approval for the proposed development.
- The applicant has incurred significant costs to date.

- With no apparent impact of the proposed/ revised road works upon the subject site, the reason for refusal appears to be made without due consideration of the proposed development.

## 6.2. **Planning Authority Response**

- None

## 6.3. **Observations**

- None

## 6.4. **Further Responses**

- None

## 7.0 **Assessment**

### 7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/ regional and national policies and guidance, I consider the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Reason for Refusal/ Prematurity
- Traffic Impacts
- Scope of Local Authority Assessment
- Other matters
  - *Pre-Planning*
  - *Value of Property*

### 7.2. Reason for Refusal/ Prematurity

- 7.2.1. The M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Project was granted by An Bord Pleanála in 2018. It is stated by the Local Authority that this decision was cleared of any legal challenges in 2021, that the project was the subject of a permitted Compulsory Purchase Order

(CPO) and that this includes lands which have been acquired on three sides of the proposed development site. Following a review of the approved design by Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII), St. Patricks roundabout has been identified as an area where further design development is stated to be required. This review is understood to be currently underway by TII and this will determine the required changes.

7.2.2. In addition to the above, the Local Authority is stated to be currently progressing the Rochestown to Douglas Active Travel Scheme and that this scheme will coincide with improvements to the Rochestown Road (R160) proposed under the M28 scheme. The design of the said Active Travel Scheme through St. Patrick's roundabout is stated to be subject to TII design review to finalise the design in that location. I note from the Local Authority website that it is intended to publish the Part 8 Planning for the said scheme in Quarter 3 of 2024. No precise maps are provided on the Local Authority website.

7.2.3. I note the extent of the proposed redline boundary, as shown on the proposed site layout map (Scale 1:250) and the proposed site location map (Scale 1:500), and I also note the proposed vehicular access arrangements and particularly the proposed new access into site no. 3. I further note the road layout drawing submitted with the appeal titled Road Layout G.A., Sheet 22 of 22, which is one of several Road Layout Drawings approved as part of the M28 Road Scheme.

7.2.4. I have compared the said drawings. I am satisfied that in the absence of the definitive and final road layout arrangement for the area, which has yet to be finalised and determined, it cannot be confirmed with certainty whether the proposed vehicular access arrangements, for example, or any other element of the proposals, will or will not serve to conflict with the development proposals presented in the subject application.

7.2.5. In my opinion therefore, the proposed development, as presented, is premature pending the determination by the Planning Authority of a road layout for the area.

7.2.6. It is therefore recommended that permission be refused.

### 7.3. Traffic Impacts

7.3.1. The Applicant has raised concern in relation to anticipated future traffic impacts which he anticipates will arise due to the proposed revised roadworks on the

adjacent lands to the immediate north. It should be noted that the said future roadworks, including the upgrade of the existing roundabout with a signalised junction, do not form part of the subject planning appeal. Notwithstanding, the principle for upgrade works on the adjacent lands to the north is established under the approved M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Road Project. The approved project was the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment Report which included detailed assessments on topics which included Human Health, Traffic and Transportation, Air and Climatic Factors, Noise and Vibration. In my opinion, the scale of the proposed revised roadworks is such, that it is anticipated they will not give rise to significant additional impacts in terms of traffic, noise or air quality to that already approved.

- 7.3.2. As the concerns of the Applicant in relation to traffic impacts relate to future works on separate lands, I am satisfied that the proposed development, as presented, *i.e. the demolition of the existing dwelling and replacement of same with 3 no. dwellings*, will not serve to give rise to the type and extent of traffic impacts anticipated by the Applicant.

#### 7.4. Scope of Local Authority Assessment

- 7.4.1. The Applicant considers that the reason for refusal appears to have been made without due consideration of the proposed development. I note the assessment of the proposed development as presented in the Local Authority Planners Assessment Report dated 15<sup>th</sup> January 2024. The Local Authority assessment is, in my view, complete and comprehensive and is presented under a number of relevant headings which include the principle of the development, design, scale and layout, landscaping, internal floor areas, residential amenity, private open space, roads and traffic, drainage, water/ wastewater, environment, housing and flood risk. I am satisfied that the Local Authority assessment and the conclusion and recommendation reached therein is measured, logical and comprehensive. The stated reason for refusal is clear and, in my opinion, this outweighs any other positive merits the proposed development may present.

#### 7.5. Other Matters

- *Pre-Planning*

- 7.5.1. The Applicant considers that the Planning Authority granted pre-planning approval for the proposed development. Section 247 of the Planning and Development Act,

2000 to 2023, relates to consultations in relation to proposed development. Section 247 subsection 3) states '*the carrying out of consultations shall not prejudice the performance by a planning authority of any other of its functions under this Act, or any regulations made under this Act and cannot be relied upon in the formal planning process or in legal proceedings.*'

7.5.2. Notwithstanding the pre-planning advice provided by the Planning Authority on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2022, prior to the lodgement of the planning application on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2023, I am satisfied that such said advice is provided without prejudice and is not binding on any future planning decision/s made in relation to the subject site.

- *Value of Property*

7.5.3. The applicant states that refusal of this development will have a significant negative impact on the value of the site and existing property. A refusal of permission, in my view, will not significantly impact the value of the existing property as it will remain unchanged, i.e. a single dwelling. If, into the future, a development of the type proposed is approved, I do not disagree that this will most likely serve to increase the value of the site. The proposed development is however, at this present time, deemed to be premature.

## **8.0 Appropriate Assessment**

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

8.1.2. The subject site is located in an urban area to the east of the N28. The Cork Harbour SPA is the closest Natura 2000 site located approximately 0.2 kms north of the proposed development.

8.1.3. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

8.1.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Small scale and nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections



- Taking into account the determination by the Planning Authority

8.1.5. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

8.1.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 9.0 Recommendation

9.1. It is recommended that permission be refused.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposed development is premature pending the determination by the Planning Authority and Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) of a road layout for the area, namely the proposed junction layout and upgrade works to St. Patrick's Roundabout in connection with the design review for the M28 Cork to Ringaskiddy Road Project and the Rochestown to Douglas Active Travel Scheme. The proposed development 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.*

---

Frank O'Donnell  
Planning Inspector

11<sup>th</sup> October 2024

## Appendix 1 - Form 1

### EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP-318990-24		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Demolition of existing two storey dwelling and garage. Construction of 3 no. two storey dwellings. Vehicular entrance and maintain existing vehicular entrances together with all associated site works.		
<b>Development Address</b>	Beaupre, Mount Ovel, Rochestown, Mounthovel (Townland), Cork		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>No</b>	
<b>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?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
<b>No</b>	<b>X</b>		Proceed to Q.3
<b>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]?</b>			
		<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Comment (if relevant)</b>
<b>No</b>		N/A	No EIAR or Preliminary Examination required
<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	Class/Threshold.....	Proceed to Q.4

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

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form 2

### EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	ABP-318990-24	
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Demolition of existing two storey dwelling and garage. Construction of 3 no. two storey dwellings. Vehicular entrance and maintain existing vehicular entrances together with all associated site works.	
<b>Development Address</b>	Beaupre, Mount Ovel, Rochestown, Mounthovel (Townland), Cork	
<p><b>The Board carried 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.</b></p> <p><b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b></p>		
	<b>Examination</b>	<b>Yes/No/ Uncertain</b>
<b>Nature of the Development.</b>		
<b>Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</b>	The subject proposal is for 3 no. dwellings within an existing settlement and is not exceptional in terms in the context of the existing environment.	No
<b>Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?</b>	The development will not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants.	No
<b>Size of the Development</b>		
<b>Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment?</b>	The size of the proposed development, on a site measuring 0.115 hectares, and with a proposed combined gross floor space of 549 sqm is not exceptional in the context of the existing environment.	No
<b>Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and / or permitted projects?</b>	There are no significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and / or permitted projects.	No

<b>Location of the Development</b>		
<b>Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining, or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location, or protected species?</b>	The proposed development is not located on, in, adjoining, nor does it have any significant impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location, or protected species.	No
<b>Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area, including any protected structure?</b>	The proposed development does not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area, including any protected structures.	No
<b>Conclusion</b>		
<b>There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</b>	<del>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</del>	<del>There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</del>
<b>EIA is not required.</b>	<b>Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.</b>	<b>EIAR required.</b>

Inspector:

Date:

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)