



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-319491-24

Development

Planning permission for development consisting of construction of new milking parlour, dairy, plant room, collecting yard, calf shed, slatted cubicle shed and underground slurry storage tanks along with all associated site works.

Location

Knockbrack, Westport, Co. Mayo.

Planning Authority

Mayo County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

24/60033

Applicant

John Walsh

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant Permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant

James Burke

Observers

None

Date of Site Inspection

16th July 2024

Inspector

Ian Campbell

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located on the northern side of the R309, c. 4.5 km east of Westport, Co. Mayo. The appeal site is located in a rural area outside of a settlement.
- 1.2. The appeal site has a stated area of 1.15 Ha. and accommodates a farm complex to the rear of a dwelling. Access to the appeal site is via the R309. This access serves both the dwelling and the farm to the rear.
- 1.3. There are a number of dwellings to the south-east of the appeal site along the northern side of the R309.
- 1.4. The adjoining lands are indicated as being within the applicant's ownership/control, as depicted by the blue line boundary.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises 2 no. agricultural structures/sheds, specifically,
 - A shed accommodating a milking parlour, dairy, store and plant room, and a cattle enclosure (total stated floor area c. 823 sqm. with a max. height of c. 6.6 metres).
 - Material finishes to the structure are indicated as concrete and corrugated galvanised sheeting for external walls and corrugated galvanised sheeting for the roof. The structure has a concrete base.
 - 2 no. slatted tanks (c. 47 m³ and c. 138 m³).
 - The proposed structure is located in the north-eastern corner of the site, west of an existing slatted shed.
 - A slatted cubicle shed (stated floor area c. 625 sqm. with a max. height of c. 7.1 metres).
 - Material finishes to the structure are indicated as concrete and corrugated galvanised sheeting for external walls and corrugated galvanised sheeting for the roof. The structure has a concrete base.
 - An underground slurry tank is proposed (c. 354 m³).
 - The proposed structure is located to the north of an existing shed.

- All associated site works.

2.2. The planning application was accompanied by the following;

- Fertilizer Plan (refers to total grassland area of 90.73 ha. and a stocking rate of 168¹ on the holding).

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority issued a Notification of Decision to GRANT permission on the 22nd of March 2024 subject to 13 no. conditions. The following conditions are of note.

C2 - All farmyard wastes, shall be collected and stored in tanks/pits with a minimum storage capacity of 18 weeks. Soiled water shall be collected and stored in accordance with the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

C3 – In the event of there being insufficient capacity for the storage of milking parlour and dairy washings a separate soiled water tank shall be provided on site which shall have sufficient capacity to ensure that no overflow, overspill or direct discharge takes place.

C7 – Farmyard manure, slurry, silage effluent, soiled water and chemical fertilisers shall be land-spread in accordance with the requirements of the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

C9 – There shall be no change in the approved method of agricultural waste storage and disposal on site and livestock numbers shall not be increased in a manner that results in the storage requirements as outlined in the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022 being exceeded.

C10 – Silage bales shall be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

¹ Appears to be 178 no. based on breakdown provided on page 5.

C13 - Applicant shall submit a comprehensive landscaping plan for the entire site.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The report of the Planning Officer states that the proposed development, an extension to an existing established farm complex, is considered acceptable, and that it raises no planning issues or concerns. The report of the Planning Officer recommends that permission is GRANTED consistent with the Notification of Decision which issued.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Roads Design Section – report recommends standard conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

3.4. Third Party Observations

The report of the Planning Officer refers to 1 no. valid observation having been received in relation to the planning application. The report of the Planning Officer summarises the issues raised in the observation as traffic, environmental and visual concerns.

4.0 Planning History

PA. Ref. 17/250 – Permission GRANTED for slatted shed, concrete yard and associated site works.

PA. Ref. 06/3858 – Permission GRANTED for slatted house, horse stalls, sheep house and silage pit.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

5.2. National Planning Framework

- 5.2.1. National Policy Objective 23 - facilitate the development of the rural economy through supporting a sustainable and economically efficient agricultural and food sector, 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.

5.3. S.I. No. 113/2022 –European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022

- 5.3.1. The Regulations provide the relevant standards for the collection and disposal of farm yard manure to give effect to Ireland's Nitrates Action Programme for the protection of waters against pollution caused by agricultural sources.

5.4. Development Plan

- 5.4.1. The Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant development plan. The appeal site is not subject to any specific land-use zoning under the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- 5.4.2 The provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 relevant to this assessment are as follows:

- Volume 2 – Development Management Standards
 - Section 10.1.1 (Agriculture and Extractive Industries) - Siting
 - Section 10.1.2 (Agriculture and Extractive Industries) – Material Finishes
 - Section 10.1.3 (Agriculture and Extractive Industries) – Protection of Amenities

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

The appeal site is not located within or close to any European Site, NHA, or pNHA.

5.6. EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

This is a third-party appeal against the decision to grant permission. The grounds for appeal can be summarised under the following headings;

Preliminary:

- The assessment of the development was cursory given its scale, and clarity should have been sought in relation to traffic impacts.
- The proposal was not subject to pre-planning consultations, which would have addressed adverse effects.
- No supporting written statement accompanies the application.

Traffic:

- The proposal will generate significant traffic movements, including during the construction phase, and an assessment of same is required.
- Request for specific condition limiting direct access and egress solely to the R309.
- Unsuitability of L58491 as access to serve the proposal, noting its surface and width.
- The use of the L58491 has caused damage to neighbouring walls, trees, fences and to the road itself.

- Request for condition requiring development contribution in recognition of the impacts of climate change, to be made towards local highways and environmental infrastructure.
- Land associated with the proposal is dispersed, resulting in considerable traffic movements which will impact the local road network.
- An apron area on the Bullaunmaneen Road used by farm machinery is in poor condition.

Environment:

- Environmental regulations should be adhered to and water quality should be regularly monitored to ensure that breaches do not occur.
- Measures to protect an 'ecological receptor', referred to in an EIS submitted with the construction of the N5, should be investigated.

Amenity/Health:

- The amenity and value of a nearby dwelling (east of the L58491) has been affected due to damage to existing features and an old building arising from activities connected to the existing milking parlour and sheds. If the road continues to be used the proposed development will exacerbate these effects.
- The use of the L58491 by traffic has affected the health of local residents.

Impact on National Monument:

- Traffic has affected the stability of Recorded Monument, MA 088 020 Ringfort – Rath and MA 088 020001 – Souterrain.

Other Issues:

- An access track east of the sheds may require planning permission.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.3. Observations

None received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal and having inspected the site, I consider that the main issues for consideration are;

- Traffic Impact
- Water Quality
- Impact on Amenity
- Matters Arising
- Screening for Appropriate Assessment

7.2. Traffic Impact

7.2.1. The crux of the appellant's case, as outlined in their submission to the Board, is that traffic arising from the proposed development will adversely impact the local road network, in particular the L58491 (referred to by the appellant as the 'Bullaunmaneen Road') which is situated c. 220 metres east of the appeal site. The appellant contends that this road is substandard, both in terms of its condition and width, and recommends that should permission be granted, that a condition should be attached requiring the use of the R309, and not the L58491 to serve the proposed development. The appellant also states that the existing use of the L58491 by vehicles associated with the applicant's farm has caused damage to local property, including walls and trees, and the road itself.

7.2.2. The proposed development comprises 2 no. agricultural structures, specifically a milking parlour and a slatted shed within an existing established farm complex. In my opinion the proposed development would not result in significant traffic impacts noting the frequency of vehicular movements associated with the activities concerned. I note that tankers typically collect milk everyday or every other day, and that the farm currently has a milking parlour and therefore it is likely that these trips will now be linked.

- 7.2.3. Section 7.5, Volume 2 of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 requires that a Road Safety Audit (RSA) is carried out for ‘significant developments’, which it defines as development which generates 40+ traffic movements per day, or results in a modification to the road layout. I note that the proposed development is significantly below this threshold, and does not include any modification to the road layout. A RSA is therefore not required and traffic generation would not be deemed significant, based on the definition in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022 – 2028. Additionally, I note that the Roads Section of Mayo County Council did not raise any concerns in relation to the capacity of the local road network to cater for the proposal.
- 7.2.4. Regarding the appellant’s recommendation that a condition is attached prohibiting the use of the L58491/exclusive use of the R309 by traffic generated by the proposed development, having regard to the low traffic volumes generated by the proposal I do not consider that such a condition would be necessary. I also consider that such a condition would be unenforceable given the practicalities of determining which vehicles are serving which farm buildings within the wider farm complex. In any event, having inspected the appeal site and surrounding area I consider that the use of the R309 access would be more logical as it provides for a straight entry and exit route into the farm.
- 7.2.5. In summation I consider that the proposed development, during construction and operational phase, would not result in significant impacts on the local road network.

7.3. Water Quality

- 7.3.1. The appellant raises the issue of water quality in the context of adherence to environmental regulations and monitoring of same. I note that there are no watercourses on/abutting the site and I have reviewed floodinfo.ie and note that the appeal site is not indicated as being subject to flooding. In relation to the management of effluent from the proposal, I note that the proposed structures are located within an existing farm complex and both structures are to be constructed on a concrete base, with underground sealed tanks used to capture effluent. The applicant has provided a breakdown of effluent generation and storage capacity on the site. A surplus storage capacity is indicated (i.e. 744.1 m³). While the applicant indicated that effluent

generated from the proposed development is to be land spread² I note that land spreading does not form part of the current planning application/appeal.

- 7.3.2. Regarding compliance with applicable regulations, I note that the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, as amended, sets out a general obligation to ensure that the capacity of storage facilities for livestock manure and other organic fertilisers, soiled water and effluents from dung sheds, farmyard manure pits, silage pits or silage clamps on a holding shall be adequate to provide for the storage of all such substances as are likely to require storage on the holding for such period as are required in the regulations in order to avoid pollution. In the event that permission is granted for the proposal I note that the applicant will be required to construct and operate the development in accordance with the specifications set out in these regulations. Subject to compliance with these requirements, and the information submitted with the application and appeal, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to surface or groundwater pollution.

7.4. Impact on Amenity

- 7.4.1. The appellant raises concerns in relation to potential impacts the amenity and value of a nearby dwelling (stated as being east of the L58491), which it is contended has been affected due to damage to existing features, including an old building, arising from activities connected to the existing milking parlour and sheds. The appellant states that if the L58491 is used by vehicles associated with the proposed development it will exacerbate these effects. As addressed above under considerations of traffic impact, the proposed development would not result in a significant increase in traffic using the local road network and the access off the R309 would represent the most logical route to the farm for vehicles. Noting the scale of the proposal and distance to adjacent property in the area I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in significant impacts on the amenity of property in the area, including as a result of traffic movements associated with the proposal.

² See page 9 of Fertilizer Plan, reference to 'volume of cattle slurry for spreading' and land spreading maps submitted.

- 7.4.2. The appellant also notes that the use of the L58491 by traffic has affected the health of local residents. Having regard to the extent of traffic movements associated with the proposed development I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in any significant impacts on the health of residents in the area.

7.5. Matters Arising

- 7.5.1. Development Contributions – the Notification of Decision to Grant permission issued by Mayo County Council did not include a condition requiring the payment of a development contribution. I have reviewed Mayo County Council's Development Contribution Scheme 2023 and note that there is no specific exemption which would exempt agricultural structures from the scheme. Should the Board grant permission for the proposed development I recommend that a condition requiring the payment of a development contribution is attached.
- 7.5.2. Sensitive Receptor – the appellant recommends that measures to protect an 'ecological receptor', referred to in an documentation submitted during assessment of the proposed construction of the N5, should be investigated. The appellant has not specified the receptor which is referred to. I note that the appellant appended a map to his observation which he submitted to the Planning Authority. The map appears to be part of an EIS from the N5 Westport to Turlough Road Project and includes references to a number of habitats in the wider area. I am satisfied based on the information submitted with the planning application and the appeal that the proposal will not result in significant adverse effects on the habitats referred to on this map noting the scale and nature of the proposal and given that the applicant will be required to construct and operate the development in accordance with the specifications set out in the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, as amended.
- 7.5.3. Impact on Recorded Monuments – the appellant raises concerns in relation to the impact of traffic on the stability of Recorded Monuments, MA 088 020 Ringfort – Rath and MA 088 020001 – Souterrain, which are located close to/west of the junction of the L58491 and R309. I note that the proposed development is located c. 200 metres from the Recorded Monuments referred to and in my view would not affect the Recorded Monuments referred to. As addressed above, the most logical route for

vehicles to access the farm complex is via the R309 and should traffic associated with the proposal use the L58491, for whatever purpose, I am satisfied that it would not adversely affect the Recorded Monuments referred to.

7.5.4. Planning Status of Development on Site – the appellant notes that an access track, described as being located east of the sheds, may require planning permission. This appeal relates to the development described in the public notices associated with PA. Ref. 24/60033 and as such the issue raised is outside the scope of the appeal and An Bord Pleanála has no role in planning enforcement, should issues in relation to same arise.

7.5.5. Conditions - the Notification of Decision to Grant Permission issued by Mayo County Council includes a number of specific planning conditions -

C2 – provides that all farmyard wastes, shall be collected and stored in tanks/pits with a minimum storage capacity of 18 weeks. Soiled water shall be collected and stored in accordance with the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition for agricultural structures, which is more succinct, is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C3 – states that in the event of there being insufficient capacity for the storage of milking parlour and dairy washings a separate soiled water tank shall be provided on site which shall have sufficient capacity to ensure that no overflow, overspill or direct discharge takes place.

The documentation submitted with the application/appeal notes a surplus in storage capacity. I recommend that this condition is not included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C4 – requires that the structures are designed and constructed to Department of Agriculture specification.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition for agricultural structures, which is more succinct, is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C5 – requires the maintenance of gutters and downpipes, and that surface water is not discharged onto soiled areas but discharged to a soak pit.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition (i.e. that 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' is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C6 – requires the maintenance of gullies, and that polluting matter does not enter the surface water system or groundwater.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition (i.e. that 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' is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C7 – requires that farmyard manure, slurry, silage effluent, soiled water and chemical fertilisers shall be land-spread in accordance with the requirements of the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

Whilst documentation submitted by the applicant indicates land spreading the development description contained in the public notices does not refer to land spreading and therefore does not form part of the proposed development. I recommend that this condition is not included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C8 – requires that soiled yard areas are minimised to reduce the volume of soiled water being produced and to ensure that the public road is maintained in clean condition.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition for agricultural structures, which is more succinct, is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C9 – requires that there shall be no change in the approved method of agricultural waste storage and disposal on site and livestock numbers shall not be increased in a manner that results in the storage requirements as outlined in the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022 being exceeded.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition for agricultural structures, which is more succinct, is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C10 – requires that silage bales shall be stored in accordance with the requirements of the Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

I recommend that the Board's standard condition for agricultural structures, which is more succinct, is included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C12 – requires that construction and demolition waste is disposed of in accordance with national waste regulations.

This condition relate to a separate code. Section 7.8 of the Development Management, Guidelines for Planning Authorities, June 2007, states that it is inappropriate to deal with matters which are the subject of other controls, unless there is good reason to believe that they cannot be dealt with effectively by other means, that the existence of a planning condition, or its omission, will not free a developer from his or her responsibilities under other codes and it is entirely wrong to use the development management process to attempt to force a developer to apply for other some licence, approval, consent, etc. I recommend that this condition is not included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

C13 – requires the submission of a landscape plan for the entire site.

The proposed development comprises 2 no. agricultural sheds within an existing farm complex. The structures will be partially screened by existing structures on the site. In my opinion landscaping would be ineffective and would not be necessary. I recommend that this condition is not included should the Board grant permission for the proposed development.

7.6. Screening for Appropriate Assessment

- 7.6.1. I have considered the proposed development at Knockbrack, Westport, Co. Mayo in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended. The closest European Site to the subject site is Clew Bay Complex SAC (Site Code 001482), which is located c. 7 km west of the subject site. The proposed development comprises permission for 2 no. agricultural structures.

7.6.2. 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 based on the following;

- The distance from nearest European Site(s) and absence of connectivity between the development site and European Sites.
- The nature and scale of the proposed development, and location within an existing farmyard complex.

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

8.0 Recommendation

8.1. I recommend that planning permission for the proposed development should be granted for the reasons and considerations set out below.

9.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- (a) The location of the proposed development within an established farmyard and the agricultural activities carried out thereon,
- (b) The nature and scale of the proposed development, and
- (c) The provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028,

it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the local road network, water quality, amenity or on European Sites in the vicinity, and, would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, except as may
----	--

	<p>otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the Planning Authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>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 -</p> <p>(a) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of directly in a sealed system to ground in appropriately sized soakaways.</p> <p>(b) all soiled waters shall be directed to an appropriately sized soiled water storage tank (in accordance with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended, or to a slatted tank. Drainage details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>(c) all separation distances for potable water supplies as outlined in the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters)(Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended shall be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and public health.</p>
3.	<p>The structures shall be constructed in accordance with the specifications as issued by the Department of Agriculture, Farming and the Marine and referenced in the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended.</p> <p>Reason: In order to avoid pollution and to protect amenity.</p>

4.	<p>(a) A management schedule for the operation of the slatted shed and milking parlour shall be submitted to the Planning Authority, prior to the housing of animals in the facility.</p> <p>(b). The management schedule shall comply with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practices for the Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, or as otherwise updated.</p> <p>(c) The management schedule shall provide for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number, age and types of animals to be housed, • arrangements for the disposal of slurry • arrangements for the storage and disposal of manure and • the cleansing of buildings and structures, including the public road, where relevant. <p>Reason: In order to prevent pollution and in the interest of amenity.</p>
5.	<p>All foul effluent and slurry generated by the proposed development and in the farmyard 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health.</p>
6.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development shall be as submitted with the application, unless otherwise agreed in writing with, the Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. In default of agreement the matter(s) in dispute shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála for determination.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
7.	<p>The developer shall pay to the Planning Authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of</p>

	<p>the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the Planning Authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>
--	---

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Ian Campbell
Senior Planning Inspector

21st May 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála	ABP-319491-24		
Case Reference			
Proposed Development Summary	Planning permission for development consisting of construction of new milking parlour, dairy, plant room, collecting yard, calf shed, slatted cubicle shed and underground slurry storage tanks along with all associated site works		
Development Address	Knockbrack, Westport, Co. Mayo.		
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			
No	X		No further action required. No Screening Required.
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			

No		Proposed development is not of a Class.	No Screening Required.
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
No		Proposed development is not of a Class.	No Screening Required.

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

Inspector: Ian Campbell

Date: 21st May 2025