



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report 319386-24

Development	Permission for the construction of a slatted agricultural shed with crush yard, silage pit, storage shed with hardcore areas and all associated site works
Location	Carrownurlaur, Milltown, Co. Galway
Planning Authority	Galway County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/60011
Applicant(s)	Martin & Mathew Macken
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party V Grant
Appellant(s)	Frederick, David and Wu Di Wallace
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	5 th day of February 2025
Inspector	Fergal Ó Bric

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1 The subject site has a stated area of 0.88 hectares and is located in the rural townland of Carrownurlaur, approximately three kilometres south of the village of Ballindine and five kilometres northwest of the rural settlement of Milltown in north County Galway. The site is accessed from a cul-de-sac and in turn onto a local road, the L6410, which in turn accesses onto the N17, National Secondary Road, a route that links Galway with Sligo.
- 1.2 The site is currently in agricultural use and includes a three-bay shed comprising machinery and straw storage, a feed passage and dry bedding area for animal wintering and an attached lean-to structure which incorporates a feed passage and a slatted area, where there were cattle wintering on the day of my site inspection. The existing farm structures on site comprise a stated area of 540 sq. m. (square metres). There is also an adjoining hardcored area to the side and rear (east and south) of the existing farm sheds, where there are wrapped bales and machinery stored externally.
- 1.3 The existing farm sheds are set back approximately 260 metres south of the local county road and accessed from a cul-de-sac, via a double gated entrance. The cul-de-sac serves the appeal site and the adjacent residential property to the west. The site slopes gently downwards from the agricultural buildings, from south to north. There is a large undeveloped field to the east and south of the existing shed which is bound by mature trees and hedging. A field drain exists along the northern boundary of the appeal site, located approximately fourteen metres from the existing farm buildings. There is a post and wire fence and hedging along the northern and western site boundaries, and open to the field along the southern and eastern site boundaries.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development would comprise a stated total stated area of 1.020 square metres (sq. m) and would provide for a three-bay slatted shed with

underground slurry storage tank and open cattle crush yard, a silage pit and a storage shed with hardcore yard areas.

- 2.2. The slatted shed would have a length of 28.6 metres and a width of 16.16 metres and maximum ridge height of approximately 8.26 metres, consistent with the height of the agricultural shed on site. An open yard area including a cattle crush would be developed immediately south of the slatted shed and would be 28.6 metres long and 7.67 metres wide, comprising a total area of approximately 219 square metres. The storage shed would have a length of 28.81 metres and a width of 7.67 metres and maximum ridge height of approximately 9.2 metres. A silage pit is to be developed to the rear of the slatted shed with concrete apron areas at each end of the pit. The pit would have a length of 30.48 metres and a width of 14.24 metres and have rising walls on each end of the pit to contain the silage. A hardcore area is proposed between the storage shed and the existing sheds on site. Presently there are trees and a hedgerow along the western site boundary and post and wire fencing along the northern site boundary. Landscaping proposals are included in the form of tree and hedge planting along the western and northern site boundaries.
- 2.3. The Planning Authority conducted an Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening exercise and concluded the following 'Having reviewed the details as submitted particularly the Fertiliser Plan and the distance from the development to Natura 2000 sites, the Planning Authority are satisfied that adverse impacts on Natura 2000 sites can be ruled out'.
- 2.4. The Planning Authority conducted an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) preliminary screening exercise and concluded the following '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'.
- 2.5. The Planning documentation included a Fertiliser Plan (Nutrient Management Plan) providing details of Nitrogen and Phosphorus application to their lands, details of animal stocking rates, details of manure storage capacity on site and mapping illustrating the location of lands where the slurry and the farmyard manure would be spread. This plan is dated for the year 2023.

- 2.6. The Board referred the appeal to the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage, the Heritage Council and An Taisce for comment. A response was received from the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage and this will be referenced later within my assessment in relation to Appropriate Assessment (AA) screening.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

Decision

By order dated 27th day of February 2024, Galway County Council (MCC) issued notification of the decision to grant permission subject to eight standard conditions. The pertinent conditions are as follows:

Condition number 4: All farmyard wastes, slurry, manure, soiled waters and farm effluent to be managed in accordance with EU Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Water Regulations 2022.

Condition number 5: All uncontaminated surface water generated by the development, shall be disposed of to appropriately sized soakaways, in accordance with BRE Digest 365 or equivalent, and shall not be discharged to the public road or the adjoining property.

Condition number 6: The agricultural buildings shall have down pipes and gullies in order to prevent the build-up of soiled water on this farm.

Condition number 7: All foul effluent, soiled water and slurry generated by the proposed development and within the farmyard shall be conveyed through properly constructed channels to appropriate storage facilities and no effluent or slurry shall discharge to any stream, river or watercourse, or to the public road, in accordance with the plans and particulars received by the Planning Authority.

3.1 Planning Authority Reports

- 3.1.1. On the basis of the planning report, the proposals were deemed to be acceptable subject to standard agricultural conditions as set out within Section 3.0 above. A grant of permission was recommended, which forms the basis of the Planning Authority decision to grant permission.

3.2. Other Technical Reports

None received.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None received.

3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was made on the proposals by neighbouring residents, Frederick, David and Wu Di Wallace (the appellants). Many of the issues raised in the observation were also raised within the grounds of appeal (see section 6.0 of this report), and include the following:

- Adverse impact upon their residential amenity.
- That farm activities are conducted at unsociable hours during the night and result in illumination of their property.
- That the proposals are excessive, representing a 300% increase in floor area above the existing farm structures on site.
- That water quality would be adversely impacted by the proposals.
- That the proposals would adversely impact Natura 2000 sites.
- The proposals would adversely impact upon the local road network linking the appeal site to the N17 route.

4.0 Planning History

Planning Authority reference 09/1945, in 2009, Galway County Council granted planning permission for the construction of a four bay slatted shed, covered feeding passage and ancillary site development works and retention planning permission for a farm shed with cattle crush.

Planning Authority reference 05/769, in 2005, Galway County Council granted planning permission for the construction of a fodder storage facility and a four-pen sheep shed with wintering handling facilities.

5.0 Policy and Context

5.1 Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. The operative plan for the area is the Galway County Development Plan 2022 – 2028.

Section 4.7-Rural Development

There are certain industries that are suitable within the rural area outside of designated settlements. These industries include for example agriculture, horticulture, forestry, tourism and rural resources-based enterprise. These should be supported where appropriate.

RD 1 Rural Enterprise Potential ‘To facilitate the development of the rural economy through supporting a sustainable and economically efficient agriculture and food industry, together with forestry, fishing and aquaculture, energy and extractive industries, the bio-economy and diversification into alternative on-farm and off-farm activities, while at the same time noting the importance of maintaining and protecting the natural landscape and built heritage which are vital to rural tourism. Development of Cafes, Art Galleries, Hot Desk Facilities etc. which are important to the rural economy’.

Section 4.8 Agriculture

‘The Council will facilitate and encourage best practice in terms of new agricultural development’.

AD 1 Sustainable Agriculture Practices ‘To facilitate the development of sustainable agricultural practices and facilities within the county, subject to complying with best practice guidance, normal planning and environmental criteria and the development management standards in Chapter 15 Development Management Standards’.

AD 3 Modernisation of Agriculture Buildings ‘To facilitate the modernisation of agriculture and to encourage best practice in the design and construction of new

agricultural buildings and installations to protect the environment, natural and built heritage and residential amenity’.

AD 4 Agriculture Waste ‘To ensure agricultural waste is managed and disposed of in a safe, efficient and sustainable manner having regard to the environment and in full compliance with the European Communities Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters Regulations (2014) and relevant best practice guidelines’.

Map 8.1 of the Development Plan identifies the appeal site as being located within the North Galway Complex Landscape where the sensitivity is within Class 1-which has a low sensitivity to change and is unlikely to be affected by change.

5.2 Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1 The nearest Natura 2000 site to the appeal site boundary is the Lough Corrib SAC which is located approximately 3.1 kilometres south-east of the nearest boundary of the appeal site. However, the appeal site is hydrologically connected to the Lough Carra/Mask SAC (site code 001774) and the Lough Mask SPA (site code) 004062) via the Scardaun stream. These European sites are both located approximately 17.7 kilometres west of the appeal site,

5.3 Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening

5.3.1 Please see Appendices 1 and 2 below where the following conclusion was reached in relation to the proposed development and its potential to adversely impact upon the local receiving environment: ‘Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended, 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

The decision of Galway County Council to grant permission has been appealed by neighbouring residents, Frederick, David and Wu Di Wallace. The grounds of appeal include the following:

Environmental Issues

- The proposals would result in increased odours in the area and adversely impact adjacent residents and result in a depreciation of their property value.

Design and layout:

- The proposals will result in a 300% increase in floor area of farm structures on site.

Roads and Traffic:

- The construction activities would result in a deterioration of the local roadway.

Natural Heritage and biodiversity

- The appeal site is located in proximity to a Natura 2000 site where Otters are present and protected flora and fauna.
- No AA screening report was submitted by the applicants and the current proposals could have adverse impacts upon protected habitats and wildlife.
- Many habitats can be impacted by either abandonment of land and/or over intensification of lands.

Other Issues:

- The applicants are not full-time farmers.

- Farming activities are often conducted between the hours of 2am and 6am. and results in noise and light pollution from farm machinery.
- Not all structures within two hundred metres of the appeal site are shown on the plans and particulars submitted to the Planning Authority.
- The appellants front lawn is shown as agricultural lands on the plans and particulars submitted to the Planning Authority.

6.2 Applicants' Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of sets out the following:

- The applicant's family have farmed in this area over the last two centuries and have developed strong relationships with their neighbours.
- Farm improvements are necessary to enhance safety, labour requirements and to upgrade their animal handling facilities.
- Protection of the environment and farm sustainability is to the forefront of their tillage and grassland enterprise where they employ nutrient management planning, variable rate nutrient application and soil testing analysis and buffer zone enforcement.
- Less slurry spreading is used on the farm and a commitment to reduce chemical inputs on an annual basis.
- The farm has been 'Bord Bia quality assured' for the last twenty years.
- Trees and hedgerows have been planted on the farm using native species.
- Under the 'ACRES' scheme operated by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and the Marine (DAFM), the applicants have created riparian margins along river courses and erected owl boxes to encourage greater biodiversity on the farm. A badger set has been active and protected within the land for decades.
- Their environmental obligations require them to increase slurry storage capacity within the farm to cover the closed slurry spreading period.

- This increased slurry storage would allow them to comply with EU Regulations and reduce chemical fertiliser usage, protect water courses and water quality.
- Growing their own crops reduces reliance on grain imports and assists in reducing their carbon footprint.
- The storage shed is required to handle and store grain and straw.
- The proposals will not result in increased odours, the proposals will assist in reducing any odours.
- Works on occasion occur late into the evening, but rarely after 11pm, for farm safety reasons.
- Farming policy and regulation from the EU, DAFM, the EPA and EU requires them to be in strict compliance with all farming guidelines and practices and prevent the applicants from adversely impacting European sites.
- The scale of the development is modest in comparison with other neighbouring farming enterprises and will not adversely impact upon adjacent property values, as the appellants are currently residing adjacent to farmyard structures.
- The development will comply with all new farming and environmental regulations.
- The farm would not be viable for the next generation unless the current proposals are to be developed.
- Seeking that the Board uphold the decision of the PA in order that the farm enterprise can sustain itself into the future.

6.3 Planning Authority Response

None.

6.4 Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1. Having regard to the planning documentation submitted, and having conducted a site inspection, I consider that the main issues are those raised within the report prepared by the Planning Authority, those raised within the third party appeal submission and the response of the applicants to same.

- Principle of Development
- Access and Traffic
- Residential Amenity
- Environmental Issues and Water Quality
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment.

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1. The proposals would comprise the erection of a slatted agricultural shed, an open yard area with cattle crush, a silage pit and an agricultural storage shed and associated hardcore areas within the vicinity of an existing farm yard complex, The appeal site is located within a rural area, as designated within the current Galway Development Plan and there are a number of other agricultural enterprises located adjacent to the appeal site and in the wider rural hinterland. I am of the opinion that the proposals would be in accordance with Policy objective AD 1 of the current Development Plan relating to 'Sustainable Agriculture Practices' and policy objective AD3 in relation to the 'Modernisation of Agriculture buildings'.

7.2.2 I have no objection to the proposal in principle, subject to compliance with appropriate standards and demonstration that the development will not have significant adverse effects on the environment or adjacent residential amenities, would not result in the creation of a traffic hazard nor adversely impact upon any European sites. These are all matters that will be addressed as part of the assessment below.

7.3 Access and Traffic

7.3.1 It is proposed to use the existing double gated agricultural entrance to access the proposed development. This access serves the existing farmyard and agri-buildings and is located at the end of a cul-de-sac which serves the farmyard complex and an adjacent residential property (belonging to the appellants), located west of the appeal site. The cul-de-sac in turn accesses onto the local county road, the L6410, which is located approximately 700 metres west of the N17, National Secondary route. Sightlines at the existing farm entrance are adequate, given that the speed limit along local roads is 60 kilometres per hour (since the 7th day of February 2025) as implemented by the Road Safety Authority (RSA) and given the cul-de-sac only serves the appeal site and one other residential property.

7.3.2 I acknowledge that the construction traffic levels associated with the proposed development would result in an increase in traffic levels in this vicinity however, this would be temporary in nature and once constructed, the agricultural development, existing and proposed, would not result in a significant increase in traffic levels entering/exiting the appeal site, above the traffic levels that currently operate from the appeal site.

7.3.3 The appellants raised the issue of the wear and tear within the local road network that the proposals would generate. I acknowledge that the proposals will result in a certain level of wear and tear along the local roadway. However, I do not consider that the proposals will generate a significant volume of traffic and, therefore, the wear and tear would not be excessive or in excess of the wear and tear experienced on many local roads throughout the country.

7.3.4 In conclusion, I am conscious of the nature and modest scale of the agricultural development proposed in the vicinity of an established farmyard complex within a rural environment, and I consider that the proposals would be acceptable from a traffic safety perspective and would not adversely impact upon the local road network by reason of excessive wear and tear.

7.4 Residential Amenity

7.4.1 The appellants state that their residential property is located approximately 50 metres west of the appeal site. They state that the farming activities at the site often

adversely impact them by reason of noise, illumination and odour. The appellants state that they have resided in the area for the last number of years. This would suggest that they moved into this rural area where agricultural practices have been conducted for at least two centuries as stated by the applicants. I consider that within a rural environment, that noise and odours associated with farming activities are both normal and transient, in that they are not continuous throughout the year, but that they would occur from time to time and more so at times of the year when slurry spreading is permissible and harvest crops are being brought from the fields into the storage sheds to be saved for the winter period.

7.4.2 In terms of farming activities being conducted between the hours of 2am and 6am, I note that the applicants refute this claim but do acknowledge that farm activities within the site can occur up until 11pm can occur from time to time, depending on the particular season and the nature of work to be conducted at that particular time. Again, I consider it reasonable to expect farming activities be conducted after the hours of darkness and for longer periods during the harvest/slurry spreading seasons. However, I do not consider that this would be continuous and would occur over a relatively short period of time.

7.4.3 I note that there is existing hedging along the western site boundary, between the appeal site and the appellants' property and that the appellants have mature landscaping within their private amenity space area which restricts the intervisibility between the appellants' property and the appeal site. I would consider it appropriate that a planning condition be included for the augmentation of landscaping along the western site boundary in order to minimise any potential for any adverse visual impact and this would also assist in reducing any potential noise impact, if the Board deem appropriate.

7.4.4 In conclusion, I acknowledge that the adjacent residents may experience some disturbance from noise and odours and farm activities later at night, periodically, however, I do not consider that these impacts would be so adverse as to warrant a refusal of planning permission for the extension of agri-buildings within an existing established farm complex.

7.5 **Environmental Issues and Water Quality**

- 7.5.1 The planning documentation submitted by the applicants include details of animal stocking numbers and a Fertiliser Plan prepared by an agricultural advisor and dated for the year, 2023. The plan outlines that they would have 100% capacity for the storage of the manures produced within the proposed slatted unit over the required 18-week period. I note that the stated capacity of the proposed slatted tanks amounts to 652 m³ (as per the drawings submitted).
- 7.5.2 Slurry and manure will be spread directly from the slatted shed to their lands and the planning documentation includes details of land availability for spreading. Proposals in this regard have been considered acceptable by the planning authority, subject to standard agricultural practice conditions. I have no objection to the slurry spreading proposals once the spreading of slurry and manure is managed in accordance with EU Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Water Regulations 2022. A condition to this effect (condition number 4) was included as part of the Planning Authority decision. in the interest of protecting groundwater quality.
- 7.5.3 It is stated that there will be no soiled water generated by the proposed development as the animal housing will be roofed and, therefore, under cover. Handling facilities for animals (except for the yard area and cattle crush) are indoors and, therefore, no animals, slurry or farmyard manure will be stored in the open yard area. Yard areas are to be kept clean and free from any dirt or leaves. This is a matter that can be addressed by means of an appropriate planning condition, if the Board deem appropriate.
- 7.5.4 Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that the applicants have demonstrated that adequate capacity and proposals for the storage and disposal of effluent from within the appeal site. Ultimately, the management of effluent arising from agricultural activities and the undertaking of land spreading is governed by the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, and the applicant will be required to operate in accordance with the relevant DAFM specifications, especially in the light of making a grant aid application, to assist in the cost of developing the proposed farm buildings.
- 7.5.5 The Board should note that land spreading does not form part of this application, and such process is regulated under the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for

Protection of Waters) Regulations, as amended. The regulations contain specific measures to protect surface waters and groundwater from nutrient pollution arising from agricultural sources. This includes, inter alia, no land spreading within 5-10 metres of a watercourse following the opening of the spreading period (16th January for County Galway). I note that an Appropriate Assessment was completed as part of Ireland's fifth Nitrates Action Programme (NAP) 2022-2025, which is given effect by the European Communities (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022 and concluded that the programme would not adversely affect the integrity of any European Site.

7.5.6 Notwithstanding this, land spreading of manure that does not comply with the above-mentioned legislation has the potential to give rise to likely significant effects on European sites within the zone of influence, having regard to the relevant sites' conservation objectives and the likelihood for these effects have been assessed in the Appropriate assessment screening conducted by the Planning Authority and will be addressed as part of an Appropriate Assessment screening exercise included as Appendix 3 with this report.

7.5.7 In conclusion, it is acknowledged that the proposed works are located in close proximity (approximately 14 metres) from a drain running along the northern site boundary. There is, therefore, the potential that construction works, and operational use of the agricultural development may impact on the water quality of this drain, which may form part of a wider lake waterbody. This matter is discussed further in Section 8.0 of this report (Appropriate Assessment).

7.6 Other Issues

7.6.1 The appellants have raised issue of devaluation of neighbouring property. However, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area to such an extent that would adversely affect the value of property in the vicinity.

7.6.2 The appellants have also raised the issue of the increase in floor area within the site is excessive. I note that the farm structures are proposed immediately adjacent to the existing farm structures on site, thereby creating a larger cluster of farm buildings which is considered to be sustainable and minimises land wastage. The proposed

agricultural buildings would be located to the east and south of the existing farm structures and further away from the appellants property than the existing farm structures. I note that there are trees and hedgerow located along the western site boundary and mature trees and planting within the appellants garden area which restricts intervisibility between the appellants' dwelling and the appeal site. The landscaping proposals along the western boundary of the appeal site would further assist in reducing any visual or noise impacts. A condition to this effect can be included, if the Board deem appropriate.

7.6.3 In terms of procedural matters and the alleged irregularities in terms of showing the neighbouring property's lawn area as agricultural land or failing to illustrate all structures within a two hundred metre distance of the appeal site, I note that both matters were considered acceptable by the Planning Authority. I am satisfied that this did not prevent the concerned party from making an observation. The assessment above represents my de novo consideration of all planning issues.

8.0 Appropriate Assessment

8.1 Please refer to Appendix 3 (AA Screening) which contains an AA Screening Assessment Report where I have concluded the following:

I conclude within my AA Screening Assessment that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect alone on the water dependent habitats and species of the Lough Carra/Mask Special Area of Conservation (side code 001774) or bird species associated with the Lough Mask Special Protection Area (004062) from surface water run-off, sediment and hydrocarbons that may be generated during the construction phase of the development and the potential for disturbance of species within the European sites during the course of the construction activities. An Appropriate Assessment (AA Stage 2) is not required on the basis of the effects of the project alone. Further assessment of in-combination with other plans and projects is not required at this time. Likely significant effects are excluded, and,

therefore, Appropriate Assessment (Stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission be granted.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the rural location of the site; the demonstrated need for additional farm buildings to house animals on this land holding; the established and permitted farm complex and practices on the holding; the character and pattern of development in the vicinity; and to the policies and objectives of the Galway County Development Plan 2022-2028, specifically policy objective AD1 in relation to Sustainable Agriculture Practices and policy objective AD3 in relation to Modernisation of Agriculture buildings, it is considered, subject to the conditions set out below, that the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area, nor adversely impact upon the local receiving environment, nor adversely impact upon water quality, would not adversely impact upon the local road network nor give rise to disturbance of protected habitats or species in any European site. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 CONDITIONS

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application to the Planning Authority on the 8th day of January 2024, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require points of detail to be agreed with the planning authority, these matters shall be the subject of written agreement and shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The slatted shed shall be used only in strict accordance with a management schedule to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development. The management schedule shall be in accordance with the European Communities (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations, 2022.

Reason: In order to avoid pollution and to protect residential amenity.

3. All foul effluent and slurry generated by the proposed development shall be conveyed through properly constructed channels to the proposed and existing storage facilities and no effluent or slurry shall discharge or be allowed to discharge to any stream, river, or watercourse, or to the public road.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

4. Water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including the disposal of surface and soiled water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. In this regard-

(a) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of to the satisfaction of the planning authority.

and

(b) all soiled waters, shall be directed to the slatted storage tank. Drainage details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.

- 5 All storage facilities for farmyard effluent shall:
 - a) be so constructed, maintained, and managed as to prevent run-off or seepage, directly or indirectly, into groundwater or surface water of any effluent produced, and
 - b) designed and constructed in accordance with the Department of Agriculture, Food, and the Marine specifications as per the European

Communities (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations, 2022 (S.I 113 of 2022).

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection, pollution control and in the interest of public health and residential amenity.

6 The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:

(a) A plan to scale of not less than 1:500 showing –

(i) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs which shall comprise predominantly native species such as mountain ash, birch, willow, sycamore, pine, oak, hawthorn, holly, hazel, beech, or alder and which shall not include prunus species.

(ii) Details of screen planting which shall not include cupressocyparis or leylandii.

(iii) Details of roadside planting which shall not include prunus species.

(b) A timescale for implementation [including details of phasing]

All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of residential and visual amenity.

7 The use of the proposed buildings shall be for agricultural purposes only.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

- 8 The cladding to the roof and walls of the proposed buildings shall be green/dark green in colour.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

- 9 The spreading of slurry or manure from this facility shall comply with the Requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practices for the Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, or as otherwise updated.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory disposal of waste material, in the interest of amenity, public health and to prevent pollution of waters.

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.

Fergal Ó Bric
Planning Inspectorate

26th day of February 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála	319386-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for the construction of a slatted agricultural shed, open yard area with cattle crush, silage pit, storage shed with hardcore areas and all associated site		
Development Address	Carrownurlaur Milltown, Co. Galway		
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	x
		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)?			
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	Schedule 5, Part 2, Class 1 of the P & D Regulations 2001 (as amended) sets out a number of types of development which require the submission of an EIAR and includes the following: Specifically, class 1(e) sets out the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For intensive poultry farming activities not included in Part 1 of this Schedule which would have more than 40,000 places for poultry: For intensive pig farming activities not included in Part 1 of this Schedule which would have more than 2,000 places for production pigs (over thirty kilograms) in a 	x

		finishing unit, more than 400 places for sows in a breeding unit or more than 200 places for sows in an integrated unit.	
No	Tick or leave blank		

3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?

Yes	Tick/or leave blank		
No	Tick/or leave blank		X

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?

Yes	Tick/or leave blank	Proposals relate to the construction of a slatted agricultural shed, open yard area with cattle crush, silage pit, storage shed with hardcore areas and all associated site works, the threshold as set out in Schedule 5, Part 2 of the P & D Regulations 2001 (as amended) Class 1(e) specifically relate to intensive poultry and pig rearing facilities.	X
------------	---------------------	--	---

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?

No	Tick/or leave blank	X
-----------	---------------------	---

Yes	Tick/or leave blank	
------------	------------------------	--

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2-Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-319386-24
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for the construction of a slatted agricultural shed, open yard area with cattle crush, silage pit, storage shed with hardcore areas and all associated site works
Development Address	Carrownurlaur, Milltown, Co. Galway.
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. This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development	<p>The proposed development would comprise the construction of a slatted agricultural shed, an open yard area with cattle crush, silage pit, storage shed with hardcore areas and all associated site works and is located within a rural area.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed development will not</p>

	give rise to the production of significant waste, emissions or pollutants.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site, as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001, as amended, 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.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<p>The scale of the proposed development would not be described as exceptional in the context of the existing environment.</p> <p>There are no significant developments within the vicinity of the site which would result in significant cumulative effects/considerations.</p>

Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	Yes, no real likelihood of significant effects and, therefore, EIA is 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.	No
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	No

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR require

**Screening for Appropriate Assessment
Screening Determination**

Description of the project

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

The development is described in Section 2 of my report. The proposed slatted agricultural shed with a cattle crush yard area, silage pit, storage shed with hardcore areas and all associated site works development is located within a rural area on the western side of the N17, National secondary route, approximately three kilometres south-east of Ballindine in County Mayo and five kilometres north-west of the rural settlement of Milltown in north County Galway, just south of the Mayo-Galway county boundary. The appeal site comprises an established farmyard complex which includes a three-bay shed, used for the storage of machinery and straw, a feed passage and a dry bed area for the housing of cattle. There is a lean-to structure attached onto the eastern side of the three-bay structure which comprises a feed passage and a slatted unit where cattle were being housed on the day of my site inspection. There are hardcore areas around the perimeter of the existing sheds and there was machinery and wrapped silage bales stored externally on the hardcore area to the side and rear of the shed.

The appeal site is located approximately 3.1 kilometres north-west of the designated boundary of the Lough Corrib SAC (site code 000297), which is protected by a number of nature conservation designations. However, there is no surface water hydrological connectivity between the appeal site and this particular European site. However, there is a surface water hydrological connection between the appeal site and the Lough Carra/Mask Special Area of Conservation (site code 001774) and the Lough Mask Special Protection Area (site code 004062) via the Scardaun stream. These European sites are both located approximately 17.7 kilometres west of the appeal site. One of the proposed structures is to be served by underground slurry storage tanks. The second of the proposed sheds is stated to be for the storage of feed and machinery, some of which are presently stored externally on site and open

to the elements. The site is also served by a connection to the Lough Mask mains Group Water Scheme. Surface water on site is to be managed by means of a soakpit, to be designed and constructed in accordance with BRE 365 standards.

The appeal site comprises amenity grassland habitat (GA2), which is species poor and regularly mown and actively managed. The appeal site also includes buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3), spoil and bareground (ED2) and other stonework (BL1).

There is a drainage ditch along the northern boundary of the appeal site. Surface water is to be managed within drainage channels which would outfall to the underground slurry storage tanks within the bounds of the appeal site and will not drain onto the adjacent lands nor the public roadway. The appeal site is remote from the nearest boundary of Lough Carra/Mask SAC and the Lough Mask SPA European sites.

Under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) 3rd cycle 2016-2021 the Lough Carra waterbody is classified as being 'not at risk'. However, further downstream Lough Mask is classified as being 'at risk'.

In terms of ground water, the appeal site overlies the Clare-Corrib waterbody which is classified as being of 'good' status.

I note that the PA did not outline any particular issues in relation to the potential for adverse impacts upon habitats/species with the Lough Corrib SAC or any other Natura 2000 site. One third-party submission was received by the PA and raised the issue of potential to adversely impact upon Natura 2000 sites.

The Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage issued a response to the Board and set out that the appeal site is hydrologically connected to the Lough Carra Mask SAC and the Lough Mask SPA via the Scardaun stream. The Department set out that the proposed development may impact upon the European sites through a deterioration in water quality through eutrophication and run-off, and accordingly, a screening for AA should take place.

I have taken these comments into consideration in the AA Screening Assessment below.

Potential impact mechanisms from the project

The elements of the proposed development that would potentially generate a source of impact are:

- The agricultural building and its construction.
- Surface water run-off from the appeal site during the construction phase.
- Run off from the development post construction, during its operation.

There is no direct surface water hydrological connection to the Lough Carra/Mask SAC or the Lough Mask SPA from the appeal site. I note that there is a considerable separation distance between the appeal site and these two European sites, the nearest part of the Natura 2000 sites' boundaries being located approximately 17.7 kilometres south-east of the nearest part of the appeal site boundary. During the construction of the agricultural development, there would be potential surface water outfall arising from construction works (silt/hydrocarbons/construction related waste), and during the operation (where soiled/contaminated water) resulting in potential deterioration of water quality and potential for adverse impacts upon habitats/species identified as Qualifying interests (QI's) within the Lough Carra/Mask SAC and the Lough Mask SPA. Similarly, at operational stage, the surface water outfall from contaminated surface water runoff from the additional hard standing areas could impact on the lake water bodies. It is noted that the uncontaminated surface water is proposed to be managed through the use of a soakpit which ultimately would filter into the ground and not directly to the adjoining lands or public roadway.

With reference to EPA mapping, the site is underlain by carboniferous limestone within the Clare-Corrib groundwater body which is classified as having a 'good' water quality status. Therefore, groundwater is not considered to be at risk from the development proposals.

There is no evidence on file that the appeal site support populations of qualifying interest species, including Otters or waterbirds listed as qualifying species of the Lough Carra/Mask SAC/SPA. Therefore, any potentially significant *ex-situ* impacts on species associated with the Lough Carra/Mask SAC/SPA can be ruled out.

There are no other readily apparent impact mechanisms that could arise as a result of this project.

European Sites at risk

Table 1 European Sites at risk from impacts of the proposed project

Effect mechanism	Impact pathway/Zone of influence	European Site(s)	Qualifying interest features at risk
Indirect surface water pollution	Surface water outfall from the appeal site which may drain to the Lough Carra/Mask SAC located approximately 17.7 kilometres west of the nearest part of the appeal site boundary.	Lough Carra/Mask SAC (site code 001774).	<p>Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains.</p> <p>Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation</p> <p>Hard oligo-mesotrophic waters with benthic vegetation</p> <p>European dry heaths</p> <p>Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates</p>

			Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae Alkaline fens Limestone pavements Alluvial forests Lesser Horseshoe Bat Otter Slender Green Feathermoss)
--	--	--	--

Lough Carra/Mask Complex SAC.

With reference to the relevant Site Synopsis document on the NPWS website, the Lough Carra/Mask complex is dominated by two large lakes, Lough Mask and Lough Carra, and includes the smaller Cloon Lough. Most of the site is in Co. Mayo, with a small portion in Co. Galway. On the western side, the site is overlooked by the Partry Mountains, while to the east the landscape is largely low-lying agricultural land. The nearest large town is Ballinrobe which is about 4 km east of Lough Mask. The general geological character of the area is Carboniferous limestones, with some shales and sandstones on the western side of Lough Mask. The underlying geology results in a great diversity of habitats, which support many scarce and rare plants and animals. (www.npws.ie)

Step 4: Likely significant effects on the European site(s) 'alone'

Table 2: Could the project undermine the conservation objectives 'alone'

		Could the conservation objectives be undermined (Y/N)?
--	--	--

European Site and qualifying feature	Conservation objective (summary) ¹	Indirect surface water pollution	Indirect groundwater pollution
Lough Carra/Mask SAC			
Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains.	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals of sandy plains in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion below.
Oligotrophic to Mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation.	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Oligotrophic to Mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. See discussion below.	No. see discussion below.
Hard Oligo-Mesotrophic standing waters with benthic vegetation.	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Hard Oligo- Mesotrophic standing waters with benthic vegetation. in	No. See discussion below	No. see discussion below.

¹ Full versions are available at https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO1774.pdf (for the Lough Carra/Mask SAC)

	the Lough Carra/Mask SAC			
European dry Heaths	To restore the favourable conservation condition of European dry Heaths in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC	Yes. See discussion below	No. see discussion below.	
Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC	No. See discussion below	No. See discussion below.	
Calcareous fens.	To maintain the favourable conservation condition of Calcareous fens in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.	
Alkaline fens	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Alkaline	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.	

	fens in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.			
Limestone Pavements	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Limestone Pavements in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.	
Alluvial Forests	To restore the favourable conservation condition of Alluvial Forests in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.	
Lesser Horseshoe Bat	To restore the favourable conservation condition of the Lesser Horseshoe Bat in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.	
Otter	To maintain the favourable conservation condition of the Otter in the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.	

Slender Green Feather moss	To maintain the favourable conservation condition of Slender green feather moss in the Lough Corrib SAC.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion. below.
-------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

Lough Carra/Mask SAC

In relation to surface water quality, I note that the development proposed would be developed at a location removed (17.7 kilometres distant) from the nearest boundary of the Lough Carra/Mask SAC. At construction stage, it is considered that standard surface/soiled water management best practice construction measures would be sufficient to prevent the possibility of silt, sediment, soils, hydrocarbons and other construction pollutants entering the European site.

Similarly, during the operational stage, I consider that the design features proposed in the form of the soiled/surface water from hardstanding within the site will be directed to the underground slurry storage tanks and soakpit within the appeal site would be sufficient to manage soiled/surface water generated within the appeal site. I also consider that the separation distance between the appeal site and the European site in question, that even in the event that soiled/contaminated water or material entering the local drainage network, that by the time this material would reach the Lough Carra/Mask SAC boundary, it would have been subject to a high level of dilution and therefore, no adverse effect upon the qualifying interest features would arise, in such an unlikely event. Given the considerable separation distance between the appeal site and the Lough Carra/Mask SAC. I consider that it represents a weak indirect hydrological/ecological connection and, therefore, it is considered that there is very limited potential to adversely impact upon water quality within the Lough Carra/Mask SAC or to potentially significantly impact its conservation objective, to maintain or restore the favourable conservation status of habitats and species within the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.

Therefore, it is considered that there remains very limited potential to adversely impact water quality within the Lough Carra/Mask SAC. Therefore, having regard to

these standard surface/soiled water management measures, potential for adverse impacts on water quality within the Lough Carra/Mask SAC are unlikely.

In relation to potential groundwater impacts, I would note that the proposals would not require significant excavations, save for limited groundworks associated with the construction of the agri-building. I consider that best practice construction measures will serve to protect groundwater. Even if these measures should fail, this indirect hydrological link via groundwater represents a weak ecological connection. Any pollutants from the site that should enter groundwater during the construction stage, via spillages onto the overlying soils will be subject to dilution and dispersion within the groundwater body, rendering any adverse impacts on water quality within the Clare-Corrib groundwater body which would supply water into the Lough Carra/Mask SAC unlikely.

I consider that the best practice construction measures that would be adhered to at construction stage, and the relevant regulations and standard conditions that will be required to be adhered to at operational stage, are not mitigation measures intended to reduce or avoid any harmful effect on any Natura 2000 site and would be employed by any competent operator, notwithstanding any proximity to any Natura 2000 site.

Having regard to the discussion above, I conclude that the proposed development would be unlikely to significantly impact upon the water effect 'alone' or on water dependent habitats and species identified as qualifying features of the Lough Carra/Mask SAC.

Likely significant effects on the European site(s) 'in-combination with other plans and projects'

There is no evidence on file of any plans or projects that are proposed or permitted that could impact in combination with the proposed development and as such no in-combination issues arise.

I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on the qualifying features of any European sites. No further assessment is required for the project.

Overall Conclusion- Screening Determination

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on the water dependent habitats and species associated with the Lough Carra/Mask SAC or any other European site either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

It is, therefore, determined that Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] is not required.

European Sites at risk**Table 1** European Sites at risk from impacts of the proposed project

Effect mechanism	Impact pathway/Zone of influence	European Site(s)	Qualifying interest features at risk
Indirect surface water pollution	Surface water outfall from the appeal site which may drain to the Lough Mask SPA located approximately 17.7 kilometres west of the nearest part of the appeal site boundary.	Lough Mask SPA (site code 004062).	Tufted Duck Black-headed Gull Common Gull Lesser Black-backed Gull Common Tern Greenland White-fronted Goose Wetlands and Waterbirds

Lough Mask SPA.

With reference to the relevant Site Synopsis document on the NPWS website, Lough Mask, at over 8,000 ha, is the sixth largest lake in the country. It is located in south Co. Mayo with a small area extending across the border into Co. Galway. It extends for over 14 km along its long axis and is on average about 5 km in width. The underlying geology is of Carboniferous limestones, with some shales and sandstones. The main inflowing rivers are the Cloon and Robe, and the stream from Lough Carra to the north-east. The main outflow is to Lough Corrib to the south. The eastern part of the lake is edged by a low-lying shoreline which is subject to winter flooding but is considerably deeper on the western side where there is a long narrow trench with a maximum depth of 58 m. The water of the lake is moderately hard. Islands are a feature of the lake, especially in the south-east sector.

(www.npws.ie)

Step 4: Likely significant effects on the European site(s) 'alone'

Table 2: Could the project undermine the conservation objectives ‘alone’			
European Site and qualifying feature	Conservation objective (summary) ²	Could the conservation objectives be undermined (Y/N)?	
		Indirect surface water pollution	Indirect groundwater pollution
Lough Mask SPA			
Tufted Duck	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Tufted Duck in the Lough Mask SPA.	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion below.
Black-headed Gull	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Black headed Gull in the Lough Mask SPA.	Yes. See discussion below.	No. see discussion below.
Common Gull	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Common Gull. in the Lough Mask SPA	No. See discussion below	No. see discussion below.

² Full versions are available at https://www.npws.ie/sites/default/files/protected-sites/conservation_objectives/CO4062.pdf (for the Lough Mask SPA)

Lesser Black-backed Gull	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Lesser Black Headed Gull in the Lough Mask SPA	Yes. See discussion below	No. see discussion below.
Common Tern	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Common Tern in the Lough Mask SPA	No. See discussion below	No. See discussion below.
Greenland White-fronted Goose	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of the Greenland White Fronted Goose in the Lough Mask SPA	No. See discussion below	No. See discussion below.
Wetlands and Waterbirds	To maintain or restore the favourable conservation condition of Wetlands and	Yes. see discussion below.	No. see discussion below.

	Waterbirds in the Lough Mask SPA.		
--	--------------------------------------	--	--

Lough Mask SPA

In relation to surface water quality, I note that the development proposed would be developed at a location removed (17.7 kilometres distant) from the nearest boundary of the Lough Mask SPA. At construction stage, it is considered that standard surface/soiled water management best practice construction measures would be sufficient to prevent the possibility of silt, sediment, soils, hydrocarbons and other construction pollutants entering the European site. Similarly, during the operational stage, I consider that the design features proposed in the form of the soiled/surface water from hardstanding within the site will be directed to the underground slurry storage tanks and soakpit within the appeal site boundary would be sufficient to manage soiled/surface water generated within the appeal site. I also consider that the separation distance between the appeal site and the European site in question, that even in the event that soiled/contaminated water or material entering the local drainage network, that by the time this material would reach the Lough Mask SPA boundary, it would have been subject to a high level of dilution and, therefore, no adverse effect upon the qualifying interest features would arise, in such an unlikely event. Given the considerable separation distance between the appeal site and the Lough Mask SPA, I consider that it represents a weak indirect hydrological/ecological connection and, therefore, it is considered that there is very limited potential to adversely impact upon water quality within the Lough Mask SPA or to potentially significantly impact its conservation objective, to maintain or restore the favourable conservation status of habitats and species within the Lough Mask SPA.

Therefore, it is considered that there remains very limited potential to adversely impact water quality within the Lough Mask SPA. Therefore, having regard to these standard surface/soiled water management measures, potential for adverse impacts on water quality within the Lough Mask SPA are unlikely.

In relation to potential groundwater impacts, I would note that the proposals would not require significant excavations, save for limited groundworks associated with the construction of the agri-building. I consider that best practice construction measures

will serve to protect groundwater. Even if these measures should fail, this indirect hydrological link via groundwater represents a weak ecological connection. Any pollutants from the site that should enter groundwater during the construction stage, via spillages onto the overlying soils will be subject to dilution and dispersion within the groundwater body, rendering any adverse impacts on water quality within the Clare-Corrib groundwater body unlikely.

I note that best practice construction measures that would be adhered to at construction stage, and the relevant regulations and standard conditions that will be required to be adhered to at operational stage, are not mitigation measures intended to reduce or avoid any harmful effect on any Natura 2000 site and would be employed by any competent operator, notwithstanding any proximity to any Natura 2000 site.

Having regard to the discussion above, I conclude that the proposed development would be unlikely to significantly impact upon the water effect 'alone' or on water dependent habitats and species identified as qualifying features of the Lough Mask SPA.

Likely significant effects on the European site(s) 'in-combination with other plans and projects'

There is no evidence on file of any plans or projects that are proposed or permitted that could impact in combination with the proposed development and as such no in-combination issues arise.

I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on the qualifying features of any European sites. No further assessment is required for the project.

Overall Conclusion- Screening Determination

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on the waterbird species associated with the Lough Mask SPA or any other European site either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

It is, therefore, determined that Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) [under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000] is not required.