



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320014-24

Development	Permission to construct a two-storey dwelling with a domestic garage, a site specific treatment unit and percolation area including associated site works and a new site entrance.
Location	Killeens, Blarney, Co. Cork
Planning Authority	Cork City Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2442858
Applicant(s)	Darragh Toomey
Type of Application	Planning permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Date of Site Inspection	05 th December 2024
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
3.1. Decision	3
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
4.0 Planning History.....	6
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
5.1. Development Plan.....	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	9
5.3. EIA Screening	9
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Planning Authority Response	10
7.0 Assessment	11
8.0 AA Screening.....	15
9.0 Recommendation.....	16
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	16
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.32ha site is situated in a rural area on the northwestern outskirts of Cork city. It comprises a paddock which forms part of the curtilage of an adjacent dwelling and horses were grazing in the paddock during the site inspection. The general landform in the wider area is characterised by ridges and valleys. The site and adjacent land slopes up north of the site into a ridge and down to the south towards the public road L2797.
- 1.2. The site has strong boundary hedgerows and treelines to the south and east. The north and western boundaries comprise post and wire fencing. There is no direct vehicular access to the site however the access lane to the dwelling is situated 15m to the northwest which connects to a cul-de-sac / laneway shared between three dwellings, a commercial yard and a farmyard.
- 1.3. There are two other dwellings situated on adjacent land to the south. To the north lies another field within the curtilage of the aforementioned main dwelling while land to the east comprises a large field unconnected to the main dwelling.
- 1.4. Views of the Apple campus and its carpark are achievable from the site demonstrating its proximity to the edge of the city which is 1.5km southeast.

2.0 Proposed Development

Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:

- Construction of a two-storey 188m² detached dwelling and 40m² detached garage,
- Installation of on-site wastewater treatment and percolation area,
- New vehicular entrance connected to existing domestic lane.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

A notification of decision was issued by Cork City Council on 06th June 2024 to refuse permission as follows:

1. The subject site is located in the City Hinterland and the Planning Authority is not satisfied, having regard to the information submitted with the application, that the applicant has established compliance with Objective 3.13 and Objective 11.9 as set out in the Cork City Development Plan 2022 - 2028. It is considered therefore that the applicant does not come within the scope of exceptional housing need criteria for a house at this location and that the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. Having regard to the substantial amount of one-off housing already existing in this rural area, which is not zoned for residential development, and has no public sewerage infrastructure, the Planning Authority finds that the proposed development would contribute to an excessive density of development that mitigates against the amenities of residents and gives rise to an overconcentration of residential development in the area. The proposed development would be contrary to the Hinterland Objectives as set out in the City Development Plan 2022 - 2028 and would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. It is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its design, scale and layout as well as its prominent and elevated position on this visually exposed site, would constitute an unduly obtrusive feature in the landscape, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area and would contravene Policy Objective 11.10 as set out in the City Development Plan 2022 - 2028 which requires that all new dwelling house design must respect the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and must fit appropriately into the landscape. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
4. The site separation distances for the proposed new on-site wastewater treatment system have not been met, as outlined in Table 6.2 of the EPA Code of Practice 2021. The proposed development would, therefore, be prejudicial to public health.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.
- The report highlights how the Applicant does not have a farm, the land holding is far below the 30ha requirement and considers that the Applicant's job does not require them to reside in the rural area. It also considers the justification for a dwelling adjacent the family homeplace, in order to aid the Applicant's father in providing care to the Applicant's mother, does not meet the criteria in the Development Plan to qualify for a rural dwelling but does highlight that an adaption or extension of the existing dwelling may be considered.
- The Planners report highlights previous reasons for refusal on the site regarding dwelling design but that the same design is put forward again with no amendments. It further states '*The existence of historical development does not mitigate additional cumulative adverse visual impacts*'.
- It considers the rural area to already be subject to a significant degree of rural dwellings.
- Appropriate Assessment (AA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) issues are both screened out.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer: Request for additional information regarding the entrance design and recommendation to refer wastewater proposal to the Rural Water section as insufficient details were submitted.
- Drainage Department: No objections subject to conditions.
- Rural Water: Recommendation to refuse permission due to non-adherence to EPA Code of Practice 2021.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No reports received.

4.0 Planning History

- 22/41565: Planning permission refused to construct one detached dwelling, on-site wastewater treatment and new site entrance. Permission was refused for 3no. reasons relating to non-compliance with local need criteria, excessive density of development in the rural unserviced area and visual impact.
- 19/5374: Planning permission refused for the construction of 2no. detached dwellings and associated on-site wastewater treatment systems and entrance works. Permission was refused for 2no. reasons relating to visual impact and disorderly development in an area with excessive density.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the Development Plan). The site is situated in lands zoned 'ZO 20' which refers to the City Hinterland and the objective is to 'protect and improve rural amenity and provide for the development of agriculture'.
- 5.1.2. Objective ZO 20.4 refers to the development of individual dwellings in the city hinterland area as follows:

Single housing in the City Hinterland will be facilitated only where the objectives and requirements on rural housing set out in Chapter 3 Delivering Homes and Communities are met. Housing must be based on exceptional rural housing need and on the core considerations of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area. Other considerations including siting and design criteria are also relevant.

- 5.1.3. Housing in the city hinterland is addressed in Chapter 3 of the Development Plan. Section 3.53 states:

Rural-generated one-off housing will be considered outside of the designated villages providing:

The overall objective of maintaining the open character of the lands is maintained;

The nearest village is more than 1 kilometre from the subject site on a farm / landholding;

The farm is greater than 30 hectares in size;

Proposals for new dwellings are supported by a demonstrable case to justify a genuine need to reside on the farm holding; and

The proposed dwelling ideally utilizes the conservation / conversion of an agricultural built heritage asset (e.g. farmhouse, cottage or historic farm building of built heritage significance).

- 5.1.4. Objective 3.13 provides further context to manage single dwellings in the city hinterland:

Rural Generated Housing

a. To sustain and renew established rural communities, by facilitating those with a rural generated housing need to live within their rural community (see Objective 11.9 – One-Off Housing: Demonstrable Need to Reside on Landholding);

b. To discourage urban generated housing in the City Hinterland;

c. The City Hinterland is the area under strongest urban generated pressure for rural housing. Therefore, single rural housing applicants must satisfy Cork City Council that their proposal constitutes an exceptional rural generated housing need and satisfies all the requirements of this Plan. Any application for the development of a single rural dwelling must set out a comprehensive and conclusive demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area.

- 5.1.5. Objective 11.9 sets out the criteria and circumstances an Applicant must meet in order to be eligible and meet the principle for erecting a new dwelling in the city hinterland. It states the following:

One-Off Housing: Demonstrable Need to Reside on Landholding

With reference to Objective 3.13 – Rural Generated Housing, applicants shall satisfy the Planning Authority that their proposal represents a demonstrable need to reside on the land based on their social and / or economic links to a

particular local rural area, and in this regard, must demonstrate that they comply with one of the following categories of housing need:

a. Farmers, including their sons and daughters who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the family farm;

b. Persons taking over the ownership and running of a farm on a full-time basis, who wish to build a first home on the farm for their permanent occupation, where no existing dwelling is available for their own use. The proposed dwelling must be associated with the working and active management of the farm.

c. Other persons working full-time in farming, forestry, inland waterway, or marine related occupations, for a period of over seven years, in the local rural area where they work and in which they propose to build a first home for their permanent occupation;

d. Landowners including their sons and daughters who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the landholding associated with their principal family residence for a minimum of seven years prior to the date of the planning application.

- 5.1.6. Section 11.132 states: ‘Landholding’ is to be interpreted as set out under paragraph 3.54, and ‘landowners’ is to be construed in this context. Section 3.5.4 states:

The Census 2016 illustrates that farm holdings of greater than 30 hectares are viable as full-time farms (i.e. they have an income of greater than €50,000). Farms of greater than 30 hectares generated 75% of all farm output in Ireland in 2016. Farm holdings with less than 30 hectares are considered to be part-time or “hobby” farms and wouldn’t derive a need to live on the farm holding. Less than 5% of farmers in Ireland are 35 years old, or younger (Census 2016).

- 5.1.7. Objective 9.3 refers to the provision of individual wastewater treatment systems and states that it is an objective:

To discourage the provision of single house septic tanks and treatment plants to minimise the risk of groundwater pollution in line with the rural housing policy of this Plan. Where such facilities are permitted, full compliance with the prevailing regulations and standards, including the EPA Code of Practice for

Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) (2021), will be required.

5.1.8. Objective 11.10 refers to dwelling design in rural areas and states that rural dwellings must adhere to the following:

- a. New dwelling house design must respect the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and must fit appropriately into the landscape;*
- b. Be energy efficient in their design, layout and siting;*
- c. Incorporate appropriate landscaping and screen planting by using predominantly indigenous species.*

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is situated 800m southeast of Blarney Bog proposed Natural Heritage Area and 9km west of Cork Harbour Special Protection Area.

5.3. EIA Screening

See completed Forms 1 and 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment based on the nature, size and location of the proposed development. No EIAR is required. A formal determination or notification is not required in these cases.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- The Planner's assessment suggests that policy in the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 does not facilitate the tradition of an offspring building a dwelling adjacent to their parent in order to provide care. The decision incorrectly applies the policies and objectives of the Development Plan.

- The family landholding is referred to as 4.86 acres which, it is submitted, is ample to accommodate another dwelling and therefore extending or adapting the family home should not be the only option available to the family.
- There are financial difficulties regarding the transfer of deeds, security of mortgage and assets etc surrounding adaption of the family home.
- There is a social need for the Applicant to reside on this site and provide care for his parents. It is submitted that the assessment ignored the human element of the application for the Applicant who has resided in the family home since birth. There is an existing community in the cluster of dwellings and if permission is refused, the resulting scenario would break up the community as the Applicant's parents would require nursing home care. The appeal considers that this meets the criteria of Part C of Objective 3.13 which requires demonstration of a social need to reside in the area. It further considers that '*Planning, without due deference to the human context in which an application is done, is indeed a non functioning service to the public interests.*'
- There are no wells in the area and therefore the separation distances on table 6.2 of the EPA Code of Practice are not relevant.
- The subject site is situated within a cluster of buildings which would not detract from the visual or residential amenity of the area. The dwelling design has had regard to the Local Authority's local dwelling design guidance and would be screened by existing vegetation. No additional demands are made of Local Authority infrastructure or resources.
- The appeal refutes many aspects of refusal reason no. 3. It considers the dwelling design is not excessive in scale, does not stand out and would not constitute an unduly obstructive feature in the landscape which also is not visually exposed. Its ridge line would be below that of the existing dwelling and the hill behind would screen all views from the north while trees and hedgerows would provide significant additional screening from all other directions.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- No response received.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of development – Demonstration of need,
- Principle of development – Capacity of the rural area,
- Dwelling design,
- Wastewater treatment.

7.2. Demonstration of Need

7.2.1. Objective 3.13 states that single rural housing applicants must satisfy Cork City Council that their proposal constitutes an exceptional rural generated housing need and satisfies all the requirements of this Plan. Objective ZO 20.4 also requires single housing in rural areas to be based on an exceptional housing need. Any application for the development of a single rural dwelling must set out a comprehensive and conclusive demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area. The appeal submits that the Applicant's parent's medical history is a sufficient social requirement to reside adjacent to the family home while the Planning Authority considers that is insufficient reason.

7.2.2. I note that the appeal refers to the tradition of offspring caring for their parents while Objectives 3.13 and ZO 20.4 require demonstration of an *exceptional* rural generated housing need. In my opinion, a tradition would suggest something is not exceptional.

7.2.3. Objective 11.9 sets out the only criteria and circumstances an Applicant must meet in order to be eligible and meet the principle for erecting a new dwelling in the city hinterland. As the Applicant is not a farmer or son of a farmer, the only category available to demonstrate a social connection to the area is category 'd' which is stated as follows:

'Landowners including their sons and daughters who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the landholding associated with their

principal family residence for a minimum of seven years prior to the date of the planning application.'

- 7.2.4. Section 11.132 of the Development Plan refers the reader to Section 3.54 for a definition of landholding and landowners. Section 3.54 is set out previously in this report and the Board will note it does not specifically refer to either term, however it does refer to farm holdings being either above a threshold of 30ha in order to be viable for full-time occupation and justify an on-site dwelling, or below the 30ha threshold in which case a dwelling is not required.
- 7.2.5. In this case the landholding comprises 4.86 acres which is far below the 30ha threshold and therefore the Applicant does not comply with any category of Objective 11.9. This 30ha threshold is also referred to in Section 3.53 of the Development Plan as a requirement for new rural housing as well as a requirement to justify a *genuine need to reside on the farm holding*.
- 7.2.6. The facts of the case are that the Applicant is not a farmer or the son of a farmer, and the site is not part of a farm holding. The Development Plan permits development for farmers and their offspring, on a farm holding or landholding, once that is over 30ha which is also not the case in this application. Finally, any aspect of exceptionality has not been demonstrated in this case and therefore, in my opinion, the Applicant has not demonstrated a need to reside in the rural area.
- 7.2.7. I note the case put forward by the Applicant to reside on the site which outlines a social need based on providing care for his parents. As set out in the Planner's report, there is provision made for extending or adapting the existing dwelling and I note the Applicant's case against this, however the Development Plan does not provide a category of local need to construct an entire new dwelling on this basis.

7.3. Capacity of the Rural Area

- 7.3.1. Section 3.53 of the Development Plan sets out high level siting requirements for new rural housing including that the open character of the lands is maintained and the nearest village is more than 1km from the site. These two criteria are met in this case as the site is over 1km from Killeens, Blarney and Kerry Pike while the site also benefits from being situated within the confines of a dispersed cluster with strong hedgerows and boundaries.

7.3.2. In my opinion there is capacity for a dwelling on the site, subject to a very sensitive dwelling design due to the enclosed nature of the site with existing mature boundaries and vehicular access. The slightly dispersed cluster layout of existing development also lends itself well to the development potential of the site.

7.3.3. I note the following in refusal reason no. 3:

the proposed development would contribute to an excessive density of development that mitigates against the amenities of residents and gives rise to an overconcentration of residential development in the area

7.3.4. I consider that the addition of another dwelling would increase the density of the rural area and as set out later, there are potential concerns regarding the ability of the site to accommodate a wastewater treatment system which is also related to the density of dwellings in the area. However, in the event that planning permission were granted, I do not consider that there would be any adverse impact on the amenity of existing nearby dwellings.

7.4. Dwelling Design

7.4.1. The proposed dwelling comprises a detached 6.6m high 188m², two-storey dwelling. The design is a contemporary take on a traditional narrow plan farmhouse with small two-storey projections to the front (north) and rear (south).

7.4.2. The dwelling is situated c. 40m from the southern boundary which is the lowest point in the site. The site slopes up from south to north and is highly visible from long distance views from the L2796 to the south.

7.4.3. The dwelling design, in isolation of the site context, is considered acceptable for the rural area. I noted an older more traditional two storey farmhouse 180m east of the site during the site inspection and note design references including the narrow plan layout and high gables. However, that vernacular dwelling is much simpler in form, has three bays and is c.13m in length with no projections or breakfronts. The proposed dwelling is more complex in style with a larger footprint, much longer elevations and more complex fenestration which would be highly visible on the site.

7.4.4. I acknowledge that views from the north are entirely obscured by the ridge behind, that the site has extensive natural vegetative screening and that the ridge height is lower than the existing dwelling as highlighted in the appeal. However, I agree with

the Case Planner's opinion that the scale and massing of the structure is inappropriate as the site is highly visible. I consider a single storey dwelling or perhaps a split level dwelling would assimilate much better to the slope and be screened far more efficiently than the 6.6m proposed structure. Additionally, relocating downhill further south would also better utilise the screening present.

- 7.4.5. In my opinion, the proposed dwelling is not a suitable design for the site and there are better opportunities for siting and design on this site. The current proposal does not fit appropriately into the landscape and therefore does not comply with Objective 11.10 of the Development Plan.

7.5. Wastewater

- 7.5.1. A Site Characterisation Form was submitted with the application. The assessment was carried out in 2009 and is stated to be in accordance with the 2009 EPA Code of Practice (CoP) which has since been replaced by the 2021 CoP. The Site Characterisation Form makes reference to 2no. wells '*encompassing the site or close to the site and this development does not appear to affect any receptor*'. No further references are made to the wells or clarity given on what/who is the receptor and why a deviation from separation distances is acceptable.
- 7.5.2. The exact location of the wells are not specified however a screenshot is provided with the Site Characterisation Form from the Geological Survey of Ireland GIS system. It illustrates 2 wide circles each representing an area in which a well is known to be present. The western edge of both circles intercept the site. In my opinion, a high level view of this data would suggest that wells are roughly centred within the circle, however in the absence of any such information, a cautious approach would dictate that there is a well somewhere in that vicinity.
- 7.5.3. Non-compliance with Table 6.2 of the 2021 Code of Practice is set out as a reason for refusal by the Planning Authority. Table 6.2 sets out a list of separation distances between on-site wastewater treatment systems and various existing features such as wells, dwellings, drainage ditches etc. Neither refusal reason no. 4, the Planner's Report nor the internal Rural Water Section report specified which separation distance was not met.

- 7.5.4. I further note Objective 9.3 of the Development Plan requires full compliance with the prevailing regulations and standards, including the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) (2021).
- 7.5.5. In my opinion, the layout of the proposed development is such that all separation distances as specified in the EPA CoP are met with the exception however of the wells as these are an unknown factor. It is not clear where the wells are positioned, if they are in use, and for what purposes. In my opinion, a new Site Characterisation Form and assessment should be carried out, under the parameters of the revised 2021 CoP which clearly identifies the location and use of wells and as required by Objective 9.3 of the Development Plan. I consider it would be premature and prejudicial to human health to grant permission in the absence of such information.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.2. The subject site is located 9km west of Cork Harbour Special Protection Area.
- 8.3. The proposed development comprises construction of one detached dwelling, detached garage and associated on-site wastewater treatment system.
- 8.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.
- 8.5. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Small scale and domestic nature of the development,
 - 9km separation distance from nearest the European site and lack of connections,
 - Taking into account screening report/determination by Cork City Council,
- 8.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
- 8.7. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission is refused in accordance with the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the information submitted with the application together, with the requirements of Objectives 3.13, 11.9 and ZO 20.4 and Sections 3.53 and 3.54 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028, it is considered that the Applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated an exceptional housing need to reside in city hinterland in which the site is situated. The proposed development would therefore contravene Objectives 3.13, 11.9 and ZO 20.4 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. The proposed dwelling design and siting on a prominent and elevation position with long distance views to the exposed site would result in a visually obtrusive feature in the landscape which would injure the visual amenities of the area and would contravene Objective 11.10 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028 which requires new rural dwellings to assimilate appropriately into the landscape. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
3. The Site Characterisation Form received with the application and dated 12th April 2019 refers to the presence of 2no. wells encompassing or situated close to the site however the location of the wells is not specified. In the absence of a detailed analysis of the existing scenario against the EPA 2021 Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems, the proposed development would represent a hazard and be prejudicial to public health and would contravene Objective 9.3 of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028.

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.

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

10th December 2024

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	320014-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Permission to construct a two-storey dwelling with a domestic garage, a site-specific treatment unit and percolation area including associated site works and a new site entrance.		
Development Address	Killeens, Blarney, Co. Cork		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	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	X	Class 10 (b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	X	Class 10(b)(i) Threshold = 500 units Proposal = 1 unit	Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	Class 10(b)(i) Threshold = 500 units Proposal = 1 unit	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	X	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes		

Form 2
Preliminary Screening

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.

	Examination	Yes/No/ Uncertain
Nature of the Development. Is the nature of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment.	The site is greenfield with no direct vehicular access but forms part of the curtilage of an adjacent dwelling which is not exceptional in the context of the surrounding area and development.	No

Will the development result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants?	A short term construction phase would be required and the development would not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance due to its scale. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.	
Size of the Development Is the size of the proposed development exceptional in the context of the existing environment? Are there significant cumulative considerations having regard to other existing and / or permitted projects?	The development is situated in a rural area on a greenfield site to the side of an existing dwelling and the scale of the single unit proposal is not considered exceptional in the context of surrounding development. It is not likely to have any cumulative impacts or significant cumulative impacts with other existing or permitted projects.	No
Location of the Development Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining, or does it have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location, or protected species? Does the proposed development have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in	Having regard to the modest nature of the proposed development and the nature of the works constituting a single dwelling unit, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.	No

the area, including any protected structure?		
Conclusion		
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. EIA is not required.	There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** 10th December 2024