



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

320500-24

Development	Construction of 2 houses and all associated site works.
Location	Seafield, Bantry, Co. Cork.
Planning Authority	West Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24193
Applicant(s)	Caislean Properties Limited
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant subject to conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Lynda & Mike O'Donoghue
Date of Site Inspection	13 th February 2025
Inspector	Suzanne Kehely

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site of 0.081 hectares is located on the southwestern periphery of the urban environs of Bantry town being some 500m along the Scart Road from its intersection with High Street. Scart Road is a historical radial route into the town and along which development form comprises mainly residential properties in increasingly narrow and finely grained plots nearer the town centre. The subject site is in a more suburban setting where it rises above the town and where single storey bungalows line the road on each side in a looser format. Some infill back land development has taken place with two storey dwellings and thereby increasing the density and urbanising Scart Road. The subject site relates to an infill, part brownfield, part greenfield site between two bungalows and at a point where a shed type building to the front previously stood. From the history file this has been demolished since the last application. A stone wall dominates the eastern boundary with the appellant's property to the east.. Hedging and fencing marks the western site boundary. Overhead utility poles are evident across and alongside the site. The road rises in a westerly directly away from the town.
- 1.2. The building character in the immediate environs is single storey with single storey dwellings immediately adjacent to the east and west of the site and also opposite the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission was initially sought for two semi-detached dormer dwellings. This was revised in accordance with relevant revised notices whereby permission is now sought for 2 no. semi-detached single-storey houses (each revised in floor area from 89.7sq.m. to 73.1sq.m) and ancillary services.
- 2.2. The proposed layout shows a single vehicular entrance off the Scart Road providing a short access road with communal parking for 4 cars to the front. Boundary details show stone walling to be renewed along the eastern boundary and south boundary. Concrete and fence boundaries are proposed to the west and north. A post and rail fence is proposed to the front.

- 2.3. Section drawings show details of cutting into the ground along with finished floor levels and overall height as compared with adjacent properties.
- 2.4. In response to further information the house design was revised from dormer to single storey thereby reducing the height and roof profile. The footprint is moderately extended to provide 2 bedrooms and living accommodation at ground level.
- House no.1: FFL 42.79m, ridge height of 47.81mOD, rear garden of 128 sq.m.
 - House no.2: FFL 42.79m , ridge height of 47.81mOD, rear garden of 80 sq.m.
- This compares with the dwelling to east (appellant) with a FFL of 41.7m and roof ridge of 46.93mOD
- 2.5. Other surrounding dwelling heights are shown ranging from 44.91m to the northeast and 48.89 to the west.
- 2.6. A letter of consent from the landowner to the west is attached permitting works for the provision of sightlines.
- 2.7. A letter from the council confirms provisions of section 96 of the PDA 2000 as amended does not apply.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. By order dated 16th July 2024 Cork County Council issued a notification of decision to Grant Permission for the proposed development subject to 15 no. conditions.

3.1.2. Conditions

Condition 4 specifies landscaping requirements including reconstruction of the eastern boundary wall all subject to agreement.

Condition 10 specifies sight distance and their maintenance.

Condition 15 specifies s.48 contribution

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Report (6th June 2024): Concerns expressed about (1) the dormer dwellings being out of character and (2) impact on adjacent dwelling in terms of

overshadowing and overbearing nature , as compared to the permitted development. Accordingly revised proposals sought to address the form, nature, scale and height.

- 3.2.2. Planning Report 16th July 2024: On review of the revised design, satisfied that the proposed development will not have a significant impact. Noting further objections, the loss of light in adjacent property is considered to be minimal and garden space is adequate and in accordance with the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlement Guidelines. Proximity to town is further noted and it is noted to meet the 15minute walking distance criteria.

3.3. **Other Technical Reports**

- 3.3.1. Area Engineer: The report points out a potential landlocking of the site to the rear. Sight distance of 50m is considered satisfactory. Reference is made to an option to upgrade the Scart Road as part of a Bantry Relief Road scheme, but the Roads Design Office has no objection to the proposed development. A soakaway is pretence to connection to the public sewer. Connections to water and waste water services require consent otherwise there is no objection to the proposed development.

3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

Irish Water: Appended letter (2021) confirms feasible connections to both Water and Wastewater services.

3.5. **Third Party Observations**

- 3.5.1. Submissions were received from the appellants in respect of concerns regarding exceeding what has been permitted as a maximum for the site and that it constitutes overdevelopment. Concerns relate to over overlooking and overshadowing, traffic safety at entrance construction and visual impact of dormer type design.
- 3.5.2. Another objection also raises the matter to high a density,

4.0 **Planning History**

- 4.1.1. ABP 312994 (attached) refers to permission for a single dwelling on the same site. This was revised from two dwellings on foot of a request for further information. The decision to grant permission for the single dwelling was upheld on appeal. Condition

6 requires details of boundary treatment including landscaping to be submitted for agreement with the planning authority.

In the appeal in that case, concern was raised about trees, if planted on the shared eastern boundary of the site, as they could cause serious harm to their property if allowed to grow above 1.8m.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. In the Sustainable Settlement Framework for County Cork, Bantry is designated as a County Town within 'Towns and Key Villages > 1500'. This category includes: Main Towns and Villages which provide a housing, employment or service function.

- **Objective ZU 18-9:** Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses: The scale of new residential and mixed residential developments within the Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses within the settlement network should normally respect the pattern and grain of existing urban development in the surrounding area

5.2. West Cork Municipal District Plan 2022-2028

- 5.3. Bantry is designated as a main town. The overall strategy aims to develop Bantry as the primary urban centre and gateway for the western part of Cork.
- 5.3.1. The site is within an area governed by land use objective for 'Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses'.

5.4. National Policy National Planning Framework 'Project Ireland 2040'

- 5.4.1. The NPF advocates compact settlement as a means to achieving sustainable development. West Cork is acknowledged as having rural character but including many sizable towns and villages. It states in this regard that housing development should be based on employment growth, higher densities, access to amenities and sustainable transport modes, in order to avoid long-distance commuting patterns and quality of life impacts
- 5.4.2. Key objectives include:

- National Policy Objective 3c Deliver at least 30% of all new homes that are targeted in settlements other than the five Cities and their suburbs, within their existing built-up footprints.
- National Policy Objective 13: In urban areas, planning and related standards, including in particular building height and car parking will be based on performance criteria that seek to achieve well-designed high-quality outcomes in order to achieve targeted growth. These standards will be subject to a range of tolerance that enables alternative solutions to be proposed to achieve stated outcomes, provided public safety is not compromised and the environment is suitably protected.
- National Policy Objective 33: Prioritise the provision of new homes at locations that can support sustainable development and at an appropriate scale of provision relative to location.
- National Policy Objective 35: Increase residential density in settlements, through a range of measures including reductions in vacancy, re-use of existing buildings, infill development schemes, area or site-based regeneration and increased building heights.

5.5. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024).

5.5.1. Section 3.3 of the guidelines contains Table 3.5 which defines categories of urban areas within 'Key Towns'.

- 'Metropolitan Towns (>1,500 population) – Centre and Urban Neighbourhoods'. The centre and urban neighbourhoods category includes: (i) the town centre and immediately surrounding neighbourhoods, (ii) strategic and sustainable development locations, and (iii) lands around existing or planned high capacity public transport nodes or interchanges (defined in Table 3.8). It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 50 dph to 150 dph (net) shall generally be applied in the centres and in urban neighbourhoods of Metropolitan Towns.
- 'Key Town – Suburban/ Urban Extension' describes suburban areas as comprising low density car orientated residential areas constructed at the edge of

the town, while urban extension refers to greenfield lands at the edge of the existing built-up footprint that are zoned for mixed-use (including residential) development. Densities in the range of 30dph-50dph should be applied and in such area and densities up to 80dph are to be open for consideration at 'accessible' Key Towns – Suburban/ Urban Extension locations. Section 3.3.6 addresses exceptional circumstances in the context of density requirements. Section 4 of the Guidelines deals with Quality Urban Design and Placemaking.

5.5.2. Section 5 of the Guidelines deals with Development Standards for Housing and includes a number of specific planning policy requirements (SPPRs) as follows:

- SPPR 1 – Separation Distances which requires a minimum of 16m between opposing windows serving habitable rooms at the rear or sides of houses above ground floor level.
- SPPR 2 – Minimum Private Open Space for houses; 1 bed -20sqm, 2 bed - 30sqm, 3bed -40sqm and 4 bed+ -50sqm.
- SPPR 3 – Car Parking which restricts the maximum rate of car parking provision for residential development in 'intermediate and peripheral' locations to 2 no. spaces per dwelling (exclusive of visitor spaces).
- SPPR 4 – Cycle Parking and Storage which requires a general minimum standard of 1 no. cycle storage space per bedroom (plus visitor spaces), where residential units do not have a ground level open space or have smaller terrace

5.6. Natural Heritage Designations

5.6.1. The site is not located within any designated site. The closest Natura 2000 site is Glengarriff Harbour and Woodland SAC (Site Code: 000090)) which is located approximately 8km to the northwest of the appeal site.

5.6.2. The Cusroe, Whiddy Island pNHA (Site Code: 000110) is located approximately 2.5km to the west of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

Having regard to the nature, size and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required in this case.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The grounds of appeal are submitted by residents of the adjacent dwelling to the east who object to the scale of development and impact on the amenities of their dwelling. The main points relate to:

- Overdevelopment: One house is sufficient, and one only has already been determined as being acceptable as compared to initial proposal for 2 dwellings. This was endorsed by the Board on appeal.
- Proximity to boundary and loss of privacy which is not addressed by removal of dormers.

The original objection is also attached which refers to feasibility of construction

7.2. Planning Authority Response

No further comments.

7.3. First Party Response

- The proposal is very different to the original 2 house proposal in PA ref. 21/332. The issues relate to original objection previously addressed in the redesign.
- The current proposal will have less impact than that permitted, e.g. the ridge is lower by 440mm.
- The dwellings compare favourably to a previous shed and trees which have been removed.
- 1.4m is sufficient to work with scaffolding
- If agreement cannot be reached on reconstruction of stone wall on boundary a fence will be put up in place.
- It is not overdeveloped by reference to the development zoning and objectives and national planning framework which support residential infill development
- Appearance: the concerns were submitted about an entirely different proposal. The replacement of two storey and dormer style with single storey is in keeping with adjacent development,

8.0 Assessment

8.1. Issues

8.1.1. The proposal seeks to provide two dwellings on a site where one dwelling has been permitted in 2022 on appeal. I consider the main issues in the assessment of this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of two dwellings and overdevelopment
- Residential amenity
- Traffic safety

8.2. Principle of the development

8.2.1. The appellant objects to the principle of two dwellings on a site where there is a recent extant permission for one dwelling and believes that the matter has already been decided. I do not agree with this view as the proposed development is materially different to what has been before the Board. The comparative annotated drawings submitted by the applicant with the application and in the further information response demonstrate the differences and can be seen in the attached history file. I have read the history file and examined the drawings and note the concerns in the original case wherein the proposed scheme changed from two number two-storey houses and the concerns by the planning authority in that case were based on the initial bulk of the development and its juxtaposition with the adjacent dwellings and not density. I concur with the views expressed that a condition of the Board's Order specifying 'one dwelling' simply clarifies the scope of the permission where different versions were proposed and the latest design before the Board in that case was for one dwelling. I would not interpret it as a judgment on the limit on quantity of dwelling units permissible. In any event there is nothing to preclude another application.

8.2.2. As previously determined the principle of housing on this infill site is in keeping the land use designation for the area being 'Existing Residential / Mixed Residential and Other Uses' under the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. This is further supported by National Planning Framework NPO 3c in directing development to within existing built-up footprints.

8.2.3. In terms of density, the proposal for 2 dwellings is very low. I say this by reference to the policies in the National Planning Framework and moreover to the Compact Settlement Guidelines by which the proposal is exceptionally low. This however is appropriate by reason of the immediate context and constraints of the site. In terms of proposed size and layout I also refer to the same guidelines and note that the floor areas, open space areas and provision for car parking are all in accordance with the design guide criteria. Accordingly, I do not consider the proposed development to amount to an excessive or inappropriate density and the two houses are I consider acceptable in principle.

8.3. Impact on residential amenity.

8.3.1. In terms of design detail and its interface with surrounding development, regard must be had to the objective for the governing land use which is to conserve and enhance the quality and character of established residential communities and protect their amenities. Infill developments, extensions, and the refurbishment of existing dwellings will be considered where they are appropriate to the character and pattern of development in the area and do not significantly affect the amenities of surrounding properties.

8.3.2. The appellant is concerned about the visual appearance of 2 dwellings and how they are squeezed into the site, although this criticism is I consider more levelled at the original design which included dormers and angled bay windows in the front elevation. I note that the house in the extant permission has a floor area of 114.23m² with finished floor level 43.19mOD an overall height of the 5.064m which gives a ridge height of over 48mOD. In this case the proposal has been modified to address its localised impact in terms of visual amenity and overshadowing. Firstly, the houses have been reduced in overall height by a combination of removing the dormers and remodelling the roof and secondly, by lowering the ground level such that the overall ridge is lower than that permitted. In comparison, the proposed ridge heights are below 48mOD. This is within the range of heights of adjacent dwellings. This has been achieved by reducing the ridge height by 1.3m and revising the roof pitch to 30 degrees. The bulk and massing is also reduced by use of a flat roof over a single storey annex to the rear with the overall effect of similar ridge height to that permitted. This will not be obtrusive within this streetscape. As a

single storey development and at the level proposed and also noting the set back from the road, it will I consider assimilate into the street.

- 8.3.3. In respect of concerns regarding overshadowing and enjoyment of the neighbouring property, I consider the overall height which slopes down to an eaves height of 2.6m above ground at a distance of c.1.7m from the boundary which will be in the order of 1.8m in height will not give rise to overlooking or undue overbearance..
- 8.3.4. Boundary construction rather than treatment has been raised in the appended submission. The treatment aspect was previously addressed by condition and subject to agreement. It is now proposed to reconstruct the wall as a renewed stonewall as shown on the drawings. The applicant explains how a width of 1.4m is adequate to construct the dwelling where it is closest to the boundary and acknowledges that the construction of the boundary wall will involve agreement and in the absence of such a timber fence is proposed. I consider it undesirable in terms of quality and finish to remove the stone walling. While enclosed rear boundaries can incorporate timber posts and have limited impact on the public realm and also have the benefit of retaining vegetation, I do however consider the public realm /front boundaries should be of solid construction and should reuse the stone from demolition to provide a link with the heritage of the site and contribute to the sustainable use of indigenous materials. This would be preferable to a post and rail fence to the front and where boundaries are in prominent view. I consider boundary treatment should be conditioned as before to provide for options with party boundaries.
- 8.3.5. In view of the foregoing and by reference to national and local policies and guidance and the site characteristics, I am satisfied that the proposed houses would be an acceptable form of infill housing at this location and would not give rise to serious injury of amenities in neighbouring properties.

8.4. Traffic safety

- 8.4.1. The appellants had previously raised concerns about traffic safety in terms of sightlines and inadequate parking. I note this matter was previously addressed to the satisfaction of the previous inspector and further note that the Area Engineer has raised no objections concerning sightlines, Notably, the consent from the neighbour to the west whose property is close to the road provides for the achievement of

improved sightlines where needed. The provision of 4 car park spaces also accords with the Compact Settlement Guidelines and additional car parking would be inappropriate and unwarranted in a site so close to the town centre. Accordingly, I do not consider there any grounds to refuse permission on grounds of traffic safety. I do however consider additional conditions addressing construction traffic and compliance with the Council's roads standards could be incorporated in the conditions as an additional precautionary measure.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment

- 9.1.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the development proposed and to the nature of the receiving environment, an urban and fully serviced location remote from any European site and the absence of any direct or indirect pathway between the appeal site and any European site, no appropriate assessment issues arise and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect individually or in combination with other plans or projects on a European site.

10.0 Recommendation

- 10.1. I recommend a decision to grant permission based on the following reasons and considerations.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the design, scale and layout of the proposed development, its relationship to surrounding properties, the residential land-use objective for the area, the provisions of the Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024) , the pattern of development in the area and planning history of the site, it is considered that subject to compliance with conditions below, the proposed development would not constitute overdevelopment or seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

- 1 The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 13th day of June 2024, except as may 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

- 2 A scheme indicating precise details of all boundary treatments including boundary walls to be renewed on the east and southwest of the site, proposed post and panel fencing along the west and north and any proposed boundary planting and landscaping shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development on site.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

- 3 Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

- 4 Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall enter into water and/or wastewater connection agreement(s) with Irish Water.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

- 5 The footpath shall be dished at road junction in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian safety.

- 6 The junction details which shall provide 50m sightlines in both directions and internal access road serving the proposed development, including turning bay, parking area, footpaths and kerbs shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority and in all respect with the standards set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS)

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and traffic safety.

- 7 Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

- 8 All service cables associated with the proposed development (such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television) shall be located underground. All existing over ground cables shall be relocated underground as part of the site development works.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

- 9 The construction of the proposed development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction Management Plan which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall provide details of intended construction practice for the proposed development, including traffic management, noise management and off-site disposal of construction/ excavation /demolition waste.

Reason: In the interest to public safety and residential amenity.

- 10 The communal parking area serving the residential units shall be provided with functional electric vehicle charging points. Details of how it is proposed to comply with the requirement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport.

- 11 Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0900 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

- 12 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 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.

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.

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.

Suzanne Kehely
Senior Planning Inspector

28th February 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening [EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP- 320500		
Proposed Development Summary	Two houses		
Development Address	Scart Road, Seafield, Bantry, 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) of Schedule 5 Part 2	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No	x		Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	x	Construction of more than 500 dwelling units; Urban development which would involve an area greater than 2 ha in the case of a business district, 10. ha in the case of other parts of a built-up area and 20 ha elsewhere. The development of 2 dwelling on a site of 810sq.m. is below this by a significant magnitude.	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	x	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes			

Inspector: _____

Date: 28th Feb 2025

Appendix 2 - Form 2
EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP- 320500
Proposed Development Summary	Two houses
Development Address	Scart Road, Seafield, Bantry
<p>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.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<p>The proposal is for the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwelling houses and all associated site works in an urban area 550m from the town centre. It is not an exceptional type of development in this area. The development site has access to feasible connections for public water supply and wastewater disposal. There will be a modest increase in loading. Subject to compliance with the relevant standards this will not result in pollution. Disposal of storm water to onsite tank and soak pit will not result in significant pollution. There is some site excavation and reconstruction of stonewalls which have been demolished. The proposed development will not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants.</p> <p>This is a relatively small development in this urban context. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects with other permitted developments.</p>
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be	<p>Given the urban infill nature of this serviced site there are no significant sensitivities in the immediate environs.</p>

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).		
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).	While there are issues raised in the appeal concerning proximity and localised potential impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, I do not consider them to be of a magnitude to warrant an EIA given that such matters can be addressed under normal planning considerations	
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	x
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: 28th Feb 2025

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)