



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-320800-24

Development	Retention of slatted unit shed extension and all associated site works.
Location	Derrygowna, Banteer, Co. Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	236598
Applicant(s)	Sile & Brid Murphy.
Type of Application	Retention.
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Colm Murphy.
Observer(s)	None.
Date of Site Inspection	16 th May 2025.
Inspector	Oluwatosin Kehinde

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	3
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	4
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	5
5.1. Development Plan.....	5
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	7
6.0 EIA Screening.....	7
7.0 The Appeal	7
7.1. Grounds of Appeal	7
7.2. Applicant Response	8
7.3. Planning Authority Response.....	9
8.0 Assessment.....	9
8.4. Loss of Trees	11
9.0 AA Screening.....	12
10.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD).....	13
11.0 Recommendation	13
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	14
13.0 Conditions	14
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.5057 Ha site is located in the townland of Derrygowna approximately 3km east of Lyre and approximately 5.5km south east of Banteer in County Cork. The site is relatively flat and accessed off the L1126 Road. The site is in agricultural use and within an existing farmyard with associated sheds/buildings.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is being sought for a slatted shed extension within the existing farmyard. The shed has a total floor area of 578m² with a maximum height of c.6.5m. The material finishes of the shed are in keeping with the existing sheds on site.
- 2.2. The development does not include an increase in the number of livestock.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority (PA) granted permission subject to 19 conditions. The conditions are generally standard in nature, but the following are noted:

- Condition 2 relates to the protection of the existing trees and hedgerows on site.
- Condition 3 requires the applicant to agree a landscaping plan with the PA and reinstate a native treeline to the western boundary of the site.
- Condition 5 requires the applicant to provide a drainage channel to the satisfaction of the PA.
- Conditions 8 and 9 relate to the number of animals and the capacity of effluent storage tanks to be in line with Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters regulations.

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 that the applicant prepare an AA screening report on the basis that the PA did not have enough information to complete screening for AA. As part of the RFI, the PO invited the applicant to:

- Engage a qualified and experienced ecologist.
- Submit a surface water drainage plan for the site and confirm if there is any direct discharge or connection into Black Water SAC via the site.

The applicant's response to the further information request was considered satisfactory to carry out the AA screening.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Environment – Report dated 20/02/24 and 13/08/24 stated no objection subject to conditions. The PA environmental officer considered the development as submitted to be a positive development from an environmental viewpoint. Prior to its construction, cattle had access to an open soiled feeding yard with slurry scraped into an open slurry pit during the winter housing period. This resulted in increased volumes of slurry being generated due to the ingress of rainfall.
- Ecology – Report dated 01/08/24 stated no objection subject to condition. The ecologist was satisfied that there are no potential pathways for impact on Backwater River SAC and no risk of impact to the same has either arisen or is likely to arise as a result of the development.
- Area Engineer – Report dated 08/02/24 recommended no objections subject to conditions. I note that the engineer stated that there is no grating at the entrance to stop surface water flowing onto the public road.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None received on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

The PA received one submission regarding the development and the issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- Material change of use on the site.
- Impacts on Glen River.
- The felling of woodland and the impact on wildlife.

4.0 Planning History

PA 07/6277 – Planning permission granted for the construction of stables, barn, dung storage area, effluent tank, all weather paddocks and clean yards.

ENF 22/182 – Enforcement notice on the site relating to unauthorised farm development. The development is related to the development of a shed, installation of a slurry tank, removal of large woodland, change of use of existing farmland and the demolition of an old milking parlour.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Cork County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 is the pertinent statutory plan. Chapter 8 of the plan relates to the economic development strategy for the county. Cork has a very strong agriculture and food production sector which offers continued opportunities for diversification, innovation and job creation across the county in urban and rural areas. A key element of the County's strategy to protect and enhance the County's rural areas is to provide support and encouragement for a dynamic, innovative, and sustainable agriculture and food production sector. I note the following development plan objectives:

EC: 8-13 Rural Economy

- a) Encourage employment growth in County towns to support the population of the towns and their wider rural catchments.

- b) Strengthen rural economies through the promotion of innovation and diversification into new sectors and services, including to ensure economic resilience and job creation.
- c) New development in rural areas should be sensitively designed and planned to provide for the protection of the biodiversity of the rural landscape.

EC: 8-15 Agriculture and Farm Diversification

- a) Encourage the development of sustainable agriculture and related infrastructure including farm buildings;
- b) Prioritising the development of sustainable rural housing to support working farmers and their employees (see Chapter 5 Rural);
- c) Encouraging farm diversification through the development of other sustainable business initiatives appropriate to the rural area (see Chapter 5 Rural); and
- d) Supporting appropriate proposals for sustainable tourism development. (See Chapter 5 Rural and Chapter 10 Tourism)

WM 11-3: Groundwater Protection

- a) Preserve and protect groundwater and surface water quality throughout the County.
- b) Prevent or limit, as appropriate, the input of pollutants into groundwater and prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater.
- c) Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater and ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge of groundwater with the aim of achieving good groundwater quantitative status and good groundwater chemical status.
- d) Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity in order to progressively reduce pollution of groundwater.
- e) Achieve compliance with any standards and objectives established for a groundwater dependant protected area included in the register of protected areas.

WM 11-6: Protection from Agricultural Pollution

Protect the County's waters from agricultural pollution in accordance with the Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC) through the implementation of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2017 (SI 605 of 2017) or any future revised / additional requirements and ensuring that all agricultural development shall comply with those Regulations.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

Special Area of Conservation: Blackwater River SAC (Site Code 002170) is located approximately 227m west of the site.

6.0 EIA Screening

The 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

This is a Third Party appeal by Colm Murphy and the grounds for appeal, as raised in the submission can be summarised as follows:

- There was no felling licence obtained from the department of forestry for the removal of mature woodland and the felling was done during the nesting period.
- The woodland stretches beyond an acre and comprises of trees that have been growing for more than 100 years.
- The investigation by Cork County Council regarding the woodland was lacking and they could not ascertain if the wood was there.

- Works at the site are understood to have commenced in April/May 2022 and completed in September 2022. It is not acceptable that the works were carried out in the nesting period.
- Page 5 of the Kelleher Ecology Services Ltd report shows a picture of an existing yard at the rear of the building which becomes flooded in heavy rainfall.
- There was no demolition mentioned in the conditions and wording of the application even though a milking parlour and an open slurry pit walled and gated had been demolished.
- Unauthorised developments should not be tolerated.

7.2. Applicant Response

- The woodland referred to by the appellant consisted of a row of conifer trees & scrub that bordered the original slurry storage pit and collecting yard. The trees had rotted over time due to proximity to the slurry.
- Many of the trees had fallen into the slurry pit while others were precariously leaning & dangerous. This had destabilised the integrity of the slurry pit walls.
- The trees were dangerous due to their unstable nature and location. A felling licence was not required under Section 19 of the Forestry Act 2014.
- The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) visited the site and was satisfied that there had been no breach of the Wildlife Act as amended.
- NPWS also advised the appellant of the findings and of the exemptions under the Forestry Act for felling of trees within 30 meters of a building.
- It is important to note that the appellant submitted an alleged destruction of woodland and wildlife habitat in their submission to the council even though the appellant had been notified by NPWS 6 months prior.
- Any genuine concern that the appellant had in relation to the trees and wildlife was fully investigated by the NPWS.

- All concerns relating to drainage and runoff have been outlined in the drainage plan submitted to the council with further conditions required under the permission granted.
- Tree planting within 30 meters radius of farm buildings is not advisable by the Department of Agriculture and the Tree Council of Ireland. The western side of the new building has been planted with grass seed & wildflower mixture.
- Over 1500 meters (7,500 plants) of native hedgerows and 175 native trees were planted throughout the farm in 2023.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- Conditional permission was recommended, having regard to the nature and scale of the development, the policy and site context and the initial planner's report, along with the recommendations of the Area Engineer, the Environmental Officer and the Ecologist.

8.0 Assessment

8.1. 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 are as follows:

- Principle of Development.
- Drainage
- Loss of Trees
- Other issues

8.2. Principle of Development.

8.2.1. The site is in the rural area of Derrygowna and within an existing farm complex. A key element of the council's strategy under the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 is to provide support and encouragement for a dynamic, innovative, and sustainable agriculture and food production sector. I note Objective EC 8-15a which

seeks to encourage the development of sustainable agriculture and related infrastructure including farm buildings. The development is an extension to existing farm building on site and I am satisfied that this slatted unit shed is consistent with nature of the site and is aligned with development plan objective EC 8-15a. I therefore do not have any objections to the development.

8.3. Drainage

- 8.3.1. The development does not include a water connection. The slatted shed provides a tank beneath which captures effluent generated by livestock when housed in the shed. I note that the development is an extension to an existing shed and in response to RFI, it is stated that surface water run-off will continue to percolate to the ground via two soakaways installed on site. Having visited the site, I note that there are no surface water bodies on site. I am therefore satisfied with the drainage arrangements. The PA reviewed this and did not express any concerns in this regard. I note that the PA included a condition for a drainage channel at the entrance to stop surface water flowing onto the public road. If the Board is minded to grant permission, I recommend that a similar condition be included.
- 8.3.2. The appellant has stated that the existing yard at the rear of the building becomes flooded in heavy rainfall. I note that the appellant has not provided any evidence to support this claim. The site is not within Flood Zones A or B and as such I am satisfied that the development will not lead to any flooding concerns.
- 8.3.3. It is stated that the wastewater/foul effluent (including slurry/manure and other associated dirty water) associated with the development will continue to be collected in the underlying holding tank. The collected wastewater/foul effluent will continue to be spread when appropriate on the agricultural fields associated with the applicants' landholding. The carrying out of land spreading does not form a specified part of this application. In this regard, I note that the construction and operation of the development associated agricultural activities, would be regulated by the provisions of S.I. No. 113/2022 entitled "European Union (Good Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022" (as amended).
- 8.3.4. The applicants' have stated that current livestock numbers will not be increased. I however, note that upon review of the application form, it is stated that there would

be an increase in Suckling Cows by 3 and Cattles by 12. I consider this to be a minor increase and it would not lead to a material change in the operations of the site.

8.4. Loss of Trees

- 8.4.1. I note from the site inspection that there is no significant woodland within the appeal site or the immediate surroundings. I did however observe a line of trees that bounds the site except on the western boundary. Having reviewed the historical map on Google Earth, I note that as of the 28th of March 2022, there was a row of trees bounding the site on the western side and close to where the development is located. The applicants' have stated that they removed a shelter belt treeline of rotting conifers on the western boundary of the site and planted the area with grass seed and a wildflower mixture. In addition, the overall site has been planted with 57 meters of native hedgerows along the perimeter of the site and 175 native Irish trees were provided.
- 8.4.2. Having visited the site, I am of the view that there is significant treeline cover with grassland around the site and the surrounding area. I also note that the site is a functioning farmyard with hard landscaped areas. Furthermore, from the AA screening report submitted with the application, it is stated that the site does not support habitats/species that are qualifying interests of any Natura 2000 site or of particular ex-situ ecological value for qualifying interest of any Natura 2000 site. I agree with the screening report prepared by a qualified ecologist and consider that the site is generally of low ecological value. On the basis of the information submitted, I accept the argument of the applicants' that the trees removed were necessary because of their condition. I consider the mitigatory planting to be reasonable and will add value to the local wildlife in the area over time. I note that the PA included a condition requiring the applicant to reinstate the treeline on the western boundary in the interest of visual amenity. I do not consider this to be necessary as there is another treeline cover further west of the site that screens the development.
- 8.4.3. The appellant has raised concerns that the trees were removed from a woodland without the benefit of a felling licence. The requirements for a felling licence are under a separate legal code and thus not for the Board to consider.

8.4.4. The appellant argues that the trees were removed during the nesting period. In the applicants' response to the appeal, I note the applicants' have provided evidence of engagement with the National Park and Wildlife Service (NPWS) conservation ranger that visited the site and concluded there was no breach of Wildlife Act. Notwithstanding the above, this is also a matter under a separate legal code and thus not for the Board to consider.

8.5. Other Issues

Demolition Works

8.5.1. Regarding the issue that demolition works (milking parlour and an open slurry pit structures) were not mentioned in the application form, it is a matter for the Planning Authority and not for the Board to consider. I note there is a PA enforcement case (ENF 22/182) on the site relating to this development and including the demolition of a milking parlour.

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on The Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC in view of the conservation objectives of this site and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Limited nature and scale of the development.
- Objective information presented in the screening report.
- Distances from European sites.
- Standard pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and effectiveness of same.
- The absence of meaningful pathway to any European site.
- Taking into account the screening report of the Planning Authority.

10.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD)

10.1. The subject site is located within an existing farm complex.

The development comprises the retention of a slatted unit shed extension to the existing farm building.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. 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 surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Having regard to the small scale and nature of the development.
- Lack of hydrological connections to River Glen located c. 200m west of the site.
- Adherence to the GAP regulations.

Conclusion

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

11.0 Recommendation

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

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the development within an established agricultural farmyard, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions as set out below, the development would not seriously injure any habitats or wildlife in the area and would be acceptable in terms of public health and environmental sustainability. The development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be retained 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 19th 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>The use of the building shall be for agricultural purposes only.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
3.	<p>The development constructed shall be in accordance with the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine specifications as per the European Communities (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations, 2022 (S.I 113 of 2022).</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and residential amenity.</p>
4.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements for the site, including the disposal of surface and soiled water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. In this regard: (a) uncontaminated surface water run-off shall be disposed of directly in a sealed</p>

	<p>system, and (b) all soiled waters shall be directed to a storage tank. Drainage details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and public health.</p>
5.	<p>At entrance gate, surface water shall not be permitted to flow onto the public road and a drainage channel with a min width of 6" (150mm) shall be provided across the full width of the access driveway inside the entrance gate to the satisfaction of the Council's Area Engineer. This outlet from the drainage channel shall discharge to a properly constructed percolation area, constructed using 12m of rigid 100mm diameter perforated pipe. This work shall be carried out within 3 months from the date of grant of permission.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure no surface water flows onto the public road</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

13th June 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	
Proposed Development Summary	ABP 320800-24
Development Address	Derrygowna, Banteer Co. Cork
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.	

4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Template 2: Standard AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project	Slatted shed extension			
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The shed has a total floor area of 578m ² with a maximum height of c.6.5m. The material finishes of the shed are in keeping with the existing sheds on site. The shed replaces the former open slurry pit with hardcore yard			
Screening report	Yes			
Natura Impact Statement	No			
Relevant submissions	One submission has been received by the Board on foot of the appeal and no issue has been raised in relation to impacts on European sites.			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
<p>Two European sites were identified as being located within a 15km radius zone of influence of the development as detailed in the Table below. There is no ecological justification for such a wide consideration of sites, and I have only included the one site with any possible ecological connection or pathway in this screening determination.</p>				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
The Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC (Site Code: 002170)	Estuaries [1130] Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220] Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud and sand [1310]	0.2km	There is no direct hydrological link between the site and Blackwater River SAC. There is potential for indirect effects on the SAC resulting from run off	Yes

	<p>Atlantic salt meadows (<i>Glaucopuccinellietalia maritima</i>) [1330] Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410] Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculion fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitriche-Batrachion</i> vegetation [3260] Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles [91A0] Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (<i>Alno-Padion</i>, <i>Alnion incanae</i>, <i>Salicion albae</i>) [91E0] <i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i> (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029] <i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i> (White-clawed Crayfish) [1092] <i>Petromyzon marinus</i> (Sea Lamprey) [1095] <i>Lampetra planeri</i> (Brook Lamprey) [1096] <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> (River Lamprey) [1099] <i>Alosa fallax fallax</i> (Twaiite Shad) [1103] <i>Salmo salar</i> (Salmon) [1106] <i>Lutra lutra</i> (Otter) [1355] <i>Vandenboschia speciosa</i> (Killarney Fern) [6985]</p> <p>Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>		pollutants during the operation of the development.	
Mullaghanish to Musheramore Mountains SPA (Site Code: 004162)	<p>Hen Harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>) [A082]</p> <p>Mullaghanish to Musheramore Mountains SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>	14km	<p>No direct hydrological connection with the Mullaghanish to Musheramore Mountains SPA.</p> <p>The SPA is located c.14km from the development and does not support features of ex-situ significance or value for its qualifying interest bird species Hen Harrier.</p>	No
<p>Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone <u>or</u> in combination) on European Sites</p> <p>The development will not result in any direct effects on the SAC as there is no impact-receptor pathway regarding direct impacts and habitat loss.</p> <p>AA Screening matrix</p>				

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
The Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC (Site Code: 002170)	Indirect pathway to SAC	<p>There is a potential pathway for indirect effects on the SAC via deterioration of water quality via a shared groundwater body and resulting from run off of pollutants during operation of the development. There is also a potential disturbance impact on the Otter species from the SAC</p> <p><u>Water quality</u> I note that surface water run-off from the development will percolate to ground via two soakaways installed on the site. Operational wastewater/foul effluent from the development will also continue to be collected into the underlying holding tank.</p> <p><u>Disturbance</u> There is a significant riparian corridor associated with the SAC at this point and the site is screened by existing treeline cover along L1126 Road. The site does not support habitat features (such as rivers, estuaries etc.) that could potentially be used on an ex-situ basis by qualifying interest Otter species from Blackwater River SAC.</p> <p>Having regard to the limited scale of the development with the separation distance of c.200m to the SAC, it is highly unlikely that the slatted shed could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for the QI listed</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
There is no impact-receptor pathway on any Natura 2000 site regarding potential impacts from surface water run-off associated with the development due to lack of hydrological links between the site and any Natura 2000 site as no watercourses or other overground active water-features are present at the site. Surface water run-off at the site will continue to percolate to ground via soakaways installed on the site.		
Operational wastewater/foul effluent will be collected into the underlying holding tank and will continue to be managed in accordance with EU (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations. The development has not resulted in any significant increase in the stocking density (sucklers and sheep) or other nutrient loading.		

The site does not overlook any Natura 2000 site due to distance combined with existing screening and does not support habitat features that could potentially be used on an ex-situ basis.

There is no impact-receptor pathway on any Natura 2000 site regarding potential loss/damage impacts related to the spread of invasive plants due to lack of relevant invasive species at the site.

There is no impact-receptor pathway on any Natura 2000 site regarding potential flooding/floodplain impacts as the study site is not in a flood risk zone.

Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on The Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC. The development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.

No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on The Blackwater River (Cork/Waterford) SAC in view of the conservation objectives of this site and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- Limited nature and scale of the development.
- Objective information presented in the screening report.
- Distances from European sites.
- Standard pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and effectiveness of same.
- The absence of meaningful pathway to any European site.
- The screening report of the planning authority, including the report of the CCC Ecologist.