



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320600-24

Development

Modification to existing vehicular access to provide pedestrian access, internal access road and all associated ancillary development.

Location

Lackaroe & Monkstown, Monkstown, Co. Cork

Planning Authority

Cork County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

244157

Applicant(s)

Joseph Dwyer.

Type of Application

Permission.

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission

Type of Appeal

Third Party

Appellant(s)

- (1) Timothy & Aine O'Leary
- (2) Watkin Treharne
- (3) Patrick Kevin O'Hanlon
- (4) Aidan Punch

Observer(s)

- (1) Jerry Stuart
- (2) Paula & Michael Flannery

Date of Site Inspection

13th December 2024.

Inspector

Oluwatosin Kehinde

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History	7
5.0 Policy Context	8
5.1. Development Plan	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	10
6.0 EIA Screening	10
7.0 The Appeal	10
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	10
7.2. Applicant Response	11
7.3. Planning Authority Response	12
7.4. Observations	12
8.0 Assessment	13
9.0 AA Screening	18
10.0 Recommendation	19
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	19
12.0 Conditions	20
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.1Ha site is within the townlands of Lackaroe and Monkstown and is located at the east side of Laurel Hill/Carrigmahon Hill junction. The site is bounded to the north by Rockville House, to the west by L-2480-0 and residential dwellings, to the south by Carrigmahon House and to the east by wooded lands and Carrigmahon Lodge. The site consists of an existing entrance and driveway associated with Carrigmahon Lodge.
- 1.2. Carrigmahon House, located south of the site is included in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH ref. 20987020) and the appeal site formed part of its original lands.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development comprises of the modification and closure of the existing vehicular access serving Carrigmahon Lodge to provide for pedestrian access only.
- 2.2. A new internal vehicular access road onto the public road (L-2480-0) will be provided south of the site and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority (PA) granted permission subject to 12 conditions. The conditions are generally standard in nature, but the following are noted:

- Condition 2a relates to the existing gate piers and the design for the bollards to be agreed with the conservation officer.
- Condition 2b relates to repairing of the original gates in accordance with the AHIA report submitted and
- Condition 2c relates to securing the services of a stone mason to rebuild the section of the stone wall proposed to be replaced.

- Condition 3 requires that the cutting and removal of trees, hedgerows and clearance of vegetation shall not be carried out between the 1st of March and the 31st of August.
- Condition 5 requires that work will take place in accordance with the recommendations set out in section 6 of the bat survey.
- Condition 12 relates to the permanent closure of the existing entrance to vehicular traffic by the erection of bollards.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The PA decision to grant permission is consistent with the Planning Officer's (PO) report. Following the initial assessment of the application, the PO requested further information. The concerns raised are summarised as follows:

- The PO had concerns about the removal of trees and invited the applicant to provide a strong justification and submit mitigation measures. An updated bat roost assessment was also sought.
- The PO questioned whether any significant road safety improvements will be achieved as a result of the development.
- The PO had concerns regarding the alteration to the existing entrance in terms of the impact on features of heritage interest. A Historic Landscape Report was sought in respect of the proposed works.
- The PO also had concerns about surface water flow into the site.

3.2.2. Upon receipt of the further information, the PO recommended clarification on the following issues:

- A revised landscaping plan was sought and to provide alternatives for *Ilex x meserveae*.
- Clarity on proposed mitigatory woodland trees to be planted and whether all the proposed semi-mature trees will be planted.

- To submit revised proposals to retain entrance and provide for closure with the use of bollards.

3.2.3. The applicant's response to the further information request was considered acceptable by the PA and the following includes notable revision:

- The existing entrance is to be retained, and bollards are proposed at the point where the driveway meets the road in order to facilitate the closure of the entrance to vehicles.
- Boundary wall to remain unchanged.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer – Report dated 11/06/24 stated no objections subject to conditions. The engineer initially raised concerns of sight distance and storm water. This was addressed by the applicant in their response to the further information request.
- Ecology – Report dated 19/07/24 stated no objection subject to conditions. At the initial assessment of the development, the ecologist had concerns about the removal of trees on site and requested the applicant to provide a strong justification for the removal of trees. The justification supplied by the applicant was deemed to be satisfactory to the PA ecologist.
- Conservation Officer – Report dated 20/06/24 stated no objection to a partial grant of permission subject to conditions. The conservation officer had concerns regarding the proposal to alter the existing entrance and on foot of RFI, the development was revised to retain the original entrance and provide for bollards to be erected close to the public road.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Eireann – Report dated 26/03/24 stated no objection. I note that Uisce Eireann have requested that the applicant engage with them prior to the commencement of development as there is a presence of water/waste infrastructure which may be impacted by the development.

The application was also referred to the following prescribed bodies and no submissions were received.

- Heritage Council
- Arts Council
- An Taisce
- Failte Ireland
- DAU

3.4. Third Party Observations

The PA received nine submissions regarding the development and the issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The development conflicts with the green infrastructure zoning of the site.
- The loss of trees and biodiversity.
- There is no significant improvement with regard to road safety.
- The proposal is identical to the SHD application.
- Land ownership.
- Restriction to access of public sewer maintenance.

4.0 Planning History

ABP 312651-22 – Planning permission refused for the construction of 145 houses, 26 apartments, a crèche/childcare facility and associated development. The development was refused for the following reason:

- The proposed development would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard because of the lack of information or certainty about the timing and delivery of a local access road objective PW-U-01. Furthermore, the development did not provide for an appropriate means of access and connectivity to safely facilitate pedestrians' and cyclists' movements arising

from the northern areas of the development. The development also failed to comprehensively provide appropriate means of access as required under specific objective PW-R-06 of the LAP.

I note that this permission is referenced in the third party appeals and this application is currently under judicial review. This SHD application also intended to provide for a driveway similar to the proposed development currently being sought.

PA 10/5813 – Outline permission refused for the construction of 8no. residential units and all associated site development works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Cork County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 is the pertinent statutory plan and the site has two zonings. The northern portion of the site is zoned ZU 18-9 – Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses with the following specific development objective:

“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. Overall increased densities are encouraged within the settlement network and in particular, within high quality public transport corridors, sites adjoining Town Centres Zonings and in Special Policy Areas identified in the Development Plan unless otherwise specified, subject to compliance with appropriate design/amenity standards and protecting the residential amenity of the area”.

The southern portion of the site is zoned ZU 18-13 – Green Infrastructure and of note is category B of the zoning that seeks to “retain and generally protect appropriate areas for their landscape, amenity or nature conservation value or their current or future flood management role, within Green Conservation (Landscape amenity/ nature conservation) area”. No development other than development which supports Green Infrastructure will be considered in these areas. The proposed development is predominantly in this zoning, and I also note the following specific green infrastructure objective for the site:

Objective PW-GC-05

Open Space that will remain predominantly open in character, especially retaining the existing trees and natural features on site. This area is visually important and makes a significant contribution to the setting of Monkstown. Consideration will be given to the development of four dwellings on the northern side of these lands, close to the public road and in the vicinity of the existing dwelling.

I also note the following objectives in the Cork County Development Plan

BE 15-8: Trees and Woodlands

- a) Protect trees the subject of Tree Preservation Orders.
- b) Make use of Tree Preservation Orders to protect important trees or groups of trees which may be at risk or any tree(s) that warrants an order given its important amenity or historic value.
- c) Encourage the provision of trees for urban shading and cooling in developments in urban environments and as an integral part of the public realm.
- d) Preserve and enhance the general level of tree cover in both town and country. Ensure that development proposals do not compromise important trees and include an appropriate level of new tree planting.
- e) Where appropriate, to protect mature trees/groups of mature trees and mature hedgerows that are not formally protected under Tree Preservation Orders.

HE 16-16: Protection of Non- Structural Elements of Built Heritage

Protect non-structural elements of the built heritage. These can include designed gardens/garden features, masonry walls, railings, follies, gates, bridges, shopfronts and street furniture. The Council will promote awareness and best practice in relation to these elements.

HE 16-20: Historic Landscapes

- a) Recognise the contribution and importance of historic landscapes and their contribution to the appearance of the countryside, their significance as archaeological, architectural, historical and ecological resources.
- b) Protect the archaeological, architectural, historic and cultural element of the historic/heritage landscapes of the County of Cork.

- c) All new development within historic landscapes should be assessed in accordance with and giving due regard to Cork County Councils 'Guidance Notes for the Appraisal of Historic Gardens, Demesnes, Estates and their Settings' or any other relevant guidance notes or documents issued during the lifetime of the Plan.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

Special Area of Conservation: Great Island Channel (Site Code 001058) is located approximately 2.58km north east of the site and Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (Site Code 004030) approximately 1.51km south of the site.

pNHA – Monkstown Creek is located approximately 1.15km south of the site, Great Island Channel is located approximately 2.58km north east of the site and Douglas River Estuary is approximately 2.53km north west of the site.

6.0 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 (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). 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 the report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

There are four third party appeals received from Timothy & Aine O'Leary, Watkin Treharne, Patrick Kevin O'Hanlon and Aidan Punch. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- There are concerns over the siting of bollards on disputed lands. The bollards will restrict access to the appellant's boundary wall and restrict Uisce Eireann access to a foul drain wayleave running across the site.

- The proposed changes in the application are identical to the previous SHD plan to improve traffic management in the area.
- The removal of trees will have a negative impact on the area and will impact local wildlife.
- The development may influence possible future applications previously made by another party. There have been previous attempts to develop the lands, and the proposed development will create a precedent to undermine the green belt zoning of the area.
- The development is a mechanism to advance elements of the previously refused SHD application on the site.
- The intrusion of the proposed development on the green belt zoning of the site is not acceptable and would impact on the natural features and wildlife on the site.

7.2. Applicant Response

- The 18 trees to be removed on site are justified for good reason and on the grounds of sound arboricultural management. It is proposed to provide compensatory planting on the site that will result in a net biodiversity gain.
- A portion of the site is located on land zoned for existing residential/mixed residential while the remaining site is located in an area zoned green infrastructure.
- The part of the site zoned green infrastructure will consider the development of 4 dwellings as set out in objective PW-GC-05 and considering the scale of the proposed development, the access road will not have a negative or material impact.
- All works will be carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in the bat survey.
- The portion of the land being questioned by the appellant is within the legal ownership of the applicant.

- The proposed development is a standalone development which is not linked to any other planning process raised by the appellants.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- The planning authority is of the opinion that all the relevant issues have been covered in the technical reports already forwarded to the Board and has no further comment to make in this matter.

7.4. Observations

2 submissions were received from Jerry Stuart and Paula & Michael Flannery. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed bollards will have a negative impact on the historic character of the original entrance to Carrigmahon House. The bollards will restrict access to sewers in this part of the roadway.
- An alternative solution to provide a single leaf of the restored historic gates that could be fixed closed to the centre allowing for pedestrian access only is suggested.
- The PA has not included the requirements of Uisce Eireann in the schedule of conditions.
- The piece of roadway behind the bollards is not in the ownership of the applicant.
- The development proposed supported the previous SHD on the site and it is difficult to not see that this is project-splitting.
- The loss of trees will impact on ecology, biodiversity and the heritage values of the area.
- The proposed development will impact on the character and setting of ACAs and neighbouring properties listed in the NIAH.
- The land included in the application also forms part of the previous SHD on the site. The proposal is intrinsically linked to the ABP Ref 312651.

- ABP should reject the application because the applicant has not stated the site history in their planning application form.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including internal planning authority reports and 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 are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Legal Interest
- Loss of Trees/Biodiversity
- Other issues

8.2. **Principle of Development**

8.2.1. The Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 provides two land use zonings for the site namely, “Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses” and “Green Infrastructure”. The proposed development is mainly in the green infrastructure zoning and the plan will only support developments that will ensure the protection and integrity of biodiversity. The Development Plan also provides a site-specific zoning objective for the green infrastructure zoning of the area. Objective PW-GC-05 requires that the open space remain predominantly open in character, especially retaining the existing trees and natural features on the site. This objective will also consider four dwellings within the vicinity of the existing dwelling. The full text of this objective is contained in section 5.1 above.

8.2.2. I note that there is an existing house immediately adjoining the appeal site (Carrigmahon Lodge) and this is the existing dwelling being referred to, in the objective. The proposed development relates to alterations to the existing vehicular entrance to provide a pedestrian access to the existing house and provide for a new internal access road. Having regard to the green infrastructure zoning of the site, I am of the view that the Development Plan acknowledges that the existing house (Carrigmahon Lodge) is an established form of development in the area, and I

consider the proposed development to be ancillary to the house. I therefore do not have any objections to the proposed development.

- 8.2.3. Furthermore, the proposed development relates mainly to the provision of new vehicular access onto the public road and to provide for a pedestrian only access at the existing entrance. Having inspected the site, the driveway to the existing entrance is at an acute angle with Laurel Hill and the sightlines along Carrigmahon hill is not adequate because of a bend on the road. I consider the proposed vehicular entrance to Carrigmahon Lodge will provide for adequate sightlines on Laurel Hill and would be a better option in terms of traffic safety.

8.3. Legal Interest

- 8.3.1. The appellants and one observer have raised concerns regarding the ownership of the portion of land within the site. I note they have not provided evidence to support their claims. The applicant, in their response to the appeal has provided a letter stating their legal interest in the land. In the letter submitted from their solicitor, it is claimed that the land to which this application relates is owned by the Dwyer Brothers. On the basis of the information available, I am satisfied that there is no clear information presented to conclude that the applicant does not have sufficient legal interest in the appeal site and I am satisfied that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of their legal interest for the purposes of the planning application. Furthermore, this is a matter to be resolved between the relevant parties, having regard to the provisions of S.34(13) of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.
- 8.3.2. The proposed development includes the installation of bollards on this portion of land and concerns about restricted access to an appellant's boundary wall have been raised. Having reviewed the drawings submitted, the bollards proposed are spaced c.2 m apart. While vehicular access will be restricted, pedestrian access to the boundary wall remains possible. On this basis, I consider that the installation of the bollards will not hinder future maintenance of this boundary wall.
- 8.3.3. Furthermore, concerns were raised regarding access to a foul drain wayleave crossing the site. From site inspection and the drawings provided, it appears that a manhole for drainage infrastructure is present on the public road near the existing entrance, with a pipe likely to be crossing the site. while the bollards would not

significantly impede access to this infrastructure, there is a possibility that the proposed works could affect the pipe's integrity.

- 8.3.4. I refer the Board to the Uisce Eireann report dated 26/03/24 stating no objection to the proposed development and acknowledging that there is a water/waste infrastructure that could be impacted by the proposed development. Uisce Eireann have asked the applicant to engage with them. I therefore consider that if the Board is minded to grant permission, I recommend that a condition requiring the applicant to engage and agree works conditions with Uisce Eireann be included.

8.4. Loss of Trees / Biodiversity

- 8.4.1. The appellants and observers have raised concerns that the loss of trees will impact on the biodiversity and ecology of the area. I note the arboricultural tree survey submitted by the technical consultants of the applicant and 36 trees were surveyed within the site based on BS 5837:2012. 18 trees are proposed to be removed on site and upon RFI, the applicant was invited to justify the removal of these trees. A revised tree report was submitted stating that 7 trees that will be impacted by the development are of low ecological and historic significance. 2 mature trees will also be removed as a result of fungal infection (Beech and Horse Chestnut). Out of the 9 remaining trees, 4 are proposed for removal because of road/footpath safety concerns and the others are also of low ecological and historical landscape importance.
- 8.4.2. Having regard to the information submitted and upon site inspection, I consider the proposal to be a reasonable one. The trees are to be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management and while any tree loss is regrettable, I accept the justification presented by the applicant. Having carried out a site inspection, I observed that the site comprised of mainly young tree species and some mature trees. Having reviewed the report submitted, I consider that the 18 trees earmarked for removal do not have any significant ecological value (BS 5837:2012). I again note the specific objective (PW-GC-05) associated with the site that seeks to consider 4 new dwellings within the vicinity of the site. I am of the view that the Development Plan acknowledges that there will be development works within this area that will result in some vegetative loss and as such, measures to mitigate against any loss are necessary. As part of the proposed development, the applicant intends to

provide compensatory planting of 12 semi-mature lime trees, 3 no. beech trees and 177 native woodland trees. It is stated that the proposed planting will result in a net gain of 1603.71m² of biodiversity and woodland area. On balance the loss of trees will be mitigated through the use of carefully selected trees and plants that will help to contribute to biodiversity as they mature in the development. The PA ecologist, following RFI did not have any concerns in this regard. Furthermore, it is also worth noting that the proposed development is within a small section of the significant green area that extends some 0.8km southwards to Monkstown and I am of the view that the proposal to remove 18 trees will not significantly impact on biodiversity.

- 8.4.3. Regarding potential roosting activity on the site, a bat survey was submitted with the application. It is stated that while no bats were recorded roosting within the site, there are five trees with potential roosting features for bats. Two of these trees are proposed to be removed and I note that these are the trees infected with progressive decay causing fungus *Ganoderma applanatum*. To compensate for the two mature trees, it is proposed to install 4 no. bat boxes within trees to be retained at the site. The survey also indicates that the site supports three species of foraging and commuting bats (Soprano Pipistrelle, common Pipistrelle and Leisler's Bat) and considered them to be of local ecological value. While there is a temporary loss of foraging habitats for bats, as earlier stated the site forms part of a significant linear strip of green corridor and I am of the opinion that the loss of trees as proposed will not significantly impact on bats in the area. If the Board is minded to grant permission, I recommend that a condition relating to mitigation measures in the bat survey be included.

8.5. Other Issues

Impact of Heritage

- 8.5.1. Observers have raised concerns that the proposed development will impact on the existing entrance to Carrigmahon Lodge and the listed built heritage structures within the area. The initial proposal included the removal of an original boundary wall and alterations to the existing vehicular entrance. Upon RFI, the applicant revised the proposal to keep the boundary wall and entrance unchanged. Proposed works close to the entrance now include the erection of bollards north of the existing entrance, new road access south of the entrance along the existing driveway and associated

landscaping. Having reviewed the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report submitted, I note that the existing entrance at Carrigmahon Lodge is the original carriage way entrance to Carrigmahon House. The applicant proposes to restore the entrance gates in accordance with the mitigation measures in the HIA report. The bollards proposed will be at least 25m away from the original entrance and the new road access with associated landscaping is also c.23m south of the entrance. I am therefore of the opinion that the proposed development will not impact on the existing/original entrance. The adjoining Rockville House to the north and Carrigmahon House located south of the site are the closest buildings listed in the NIAH. These buildings are at least c.44m away from the appeal site and I consider the proposed development to be at a sufficient remove from these buildings and as such no significant impact is envisaged.

- 8.5.2. One observer raised concerns that the development proposed will also impact on the ACAs in the area. The site is in between Passage West ACA located c.280m north and Upper Monkstown ACA located c.760m to the south. Having regard to the location of the ACAs, I am satisfied that the proposed development will not lead to any significant impacts.

Landscape

- 8.5.3. The site forms part of the area designated as a high value landscape and a historic landscape appraisal report was submitted as part of the application. It is stated that from the 1st edition OSI Map, the site was amongst a significant parkland of mixed woodland and clearings associated with Carrigmahon House. By the time of the 2nd edition OSI Map, the site has been significantly cleared and the site planted with new lines of trees to provide a formal tree lined avenue. During site inspection, I did not experience any formal tree lined avenue and I am of the view that the original planting is gone and, in its place, there is a wooded area which reflects the conclusions of the appraisal report submitted. The adjoining Carrigmahon Lodge also provides for a grassed garden area to the front. Having regard to the proposed works to extend the existing driveway to an exit south of the site, I am of the opinion that the development proposed is limited in scale. Notwithstanding the proposal to raise the ground level to align with the existing driveway, I am satisfied that the development will not significantly impact on the high value landscape designation of the area.

Recent Planning History

- 8.5.4. The site formed part of a previous Strategic Housing Development (SHD) application. The appellants and observers have raised concerns that the proposed development is identical to the site works proposed in the SHD application and that the development is a mechanism to advance elements of the previously refused application on the site. On the basis of information available, I view the proposed development to be a standalone development and considered on its own merit. The development will be ancillary to the use of the existing Carrigmahon Lodge and I consider that any change will require the benefit of planning permission.

Conclusion

- 8.5.5. Overall, I consider the proposed development to be carefully designed to balance preservation with change. I am of the view that the proposal to retain the original entrance to Carrigmahon House has addressed concerns about heritage impacts. The historic landscape appraisal report confirms that although the site has transformed over time, the proposed works are limited in scope, and I am of the view that it will not pose any significant negative impact to the high-value landscape designation.

9.0 AA Screening

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

The subject site is located approximately 1.51km north of Cork Harbour Special Protection Area (Site Code 004030) and 2.58km south west of Great Island Channel (Site Code 001058) Special Area of Conservation.

The proposed development comprised of the modification and closure of the existing vehicular access serving Carrigmahon Lodge to provide for pedestrian access only. The provision of a new internal access road and vehicular access onto the public road (L-2480-0) and all associated ancillary site works.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows

- Scale and nature of the development
- Distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- Taking into account screening report by Planning Authority

I conclude, 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 (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that permission should be granted subject to conditions as outlined below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, its association with the existing Carrigmahon Lodge and to its location within ZU 18-9 “Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses” & ZU 18-13 “Green Infrastructure” zoning objectives, it is considered that the proposal would be in accordance with the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, and subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously impact on the biodiversity value or landscape setting of the area, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety, would not significantly impact on the surrounding built heritage and would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 29th day of May 2024 and on the 08th day of July 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.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>(a) Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit the design of the bollards for the written approval of the Planning Authority.</p> <p>(b) The existing gate piers shall not be moved or modified. The gates shall be restored in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment report.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the architectural heritage of the area.</p>
3.	<p>Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall engage and if required enter a Diversion/Build over agreement with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water). The applicant shall adhere to the standards and conditions set out in any agreement.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water/wastewater facilities.</p>
4.	<p>A detailed construction management plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The plan shall include details of arrangements for routes for construction traffic, parking during the construction phase, the location of the compound for storage of plant and machinery and the location for storage of deliveries to the site.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable transport and safety.</p>

5.	<p>The disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent flooding and in the interests of sustainable drainage.</p>
6.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 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.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of properties in the vicinity.</p>
7.	<p>All necessary measures be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble, or other debris on adjoining roads, including responsibility and repair for any damage to the public road to the satisfaction of the planning authority, during the course of the works.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.</p>
8.	<p>Final landscape proposals and external lighting arrangements shall be submitted to the planning authority and written agreement received, prior to the commencement of development. All planting shall be native Irish species of Irish provenance and in consultation with the recommendations from the All Ireland Pollinator Plan, Pollinator Friendly planting Code Guidelines.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development, biodiversity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
9.	<p>All works will take place in accordance with the recommendations set out in Section 6 of the Bat Survey Report received by the planning authority on 29/05/2024.</p> <p>Reason: To protect bats and in the interest of proper planning.</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.

Oluwatosin Kehinde
Senior Planning Inspector

29th May 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-320600-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Modification to existing vehicular access road		
Development Address	Lackaroe & Monkstown, Monkstown, 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			Proceed to Q3.
No	X		No further action required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			

Yes			Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
------------	--	--	---

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No		Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes		Screening Determination required	

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____