



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321008-24

Development	Retention of agricultural entrance with all associated site works.
Location	Ounavarra, Clonee Road, Lucan, Co. Dublin K78HP90
Planning Authority	Fingal County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	FW24A/0306E
Applicant(s)	Stephen McEleney
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	None
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	3 rd March 2025
Inspector	Leah Kenny

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	4
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	5
3.4. Third Party Observations	5
4.0 Planning History	5
5.0 Policy Context	6
5.1. Development Plan	6
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
6.0 The Appeal	9
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	9
6.2. Planning Authority Response	10
6.3. Further Responses	10
7.0 EIA Screening	11
8.0 Assessment	11
9.0 AA Screening	16
10.0 Recommendation	17
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	17

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

Appendix 2 – Form 2: EIA Preliminary Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject entrance to be retained, is located at Coldblow, north of the river Liffey and Lucan village. The wider site (total area c 3.8 hectares) accommodates a large two-storey period dwelling house associated lands, gardens and outbuildings.
- 1.2. Vehicular access to the dwelling house is from a gated entrance at the east corner of the site. There is a laneway running along the western boundary of the site. Both access onto a road running between Lucan Bridge and the Clonee Road (L3004).
- 1.3. Adjacent to the site to the north is located sheds / warehouses that appear to be in use for commercial purposes (vans were evident entering / existing the laneway on the day of my site visit).

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development seeks retention of an agricultural entrance (including stone clad piers and walls) and all associated site excavation, infrastructural and site development works above and below ground.
- 2.2. No gates are in place; rather on the day of my site visit the entrance was blocked by bales of hay.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Fingal County Council decided to refuse planning permission for two reasons, summarised below:

1. The works interfere with the character of the landscape and protected views identified at this location within the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029.
Permitting such development would set a bad planning precedent, materially contravene Objective GINHO60 and the 'HA' zoning objective assigned to the and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The development introduces incongruous elements within the landscape, resulting in the loss of vegetation, and interferes with the character of highly sensitive Blanchardstown South are that the Development Plan seeks to preserve, thus materially contravening Objective GINHO59 and GINHO58 of the Fingal County Council Development Plan 2023-2029.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Report

The Fingal County Council Planning Reports form the basis of the decision. The report identifies the site as being located within a 'HA – High Amenity' area where there is a vision to protect such highly sensitive and scenic locations from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness and sense of place.

The report concluded that the applicant has not provided sufficient information to justify the need for the agricultural entrance and stated that it was inconsistent with Objective SPQHO69 (Vehicular Entrances). It was the opinion of the planner that the works proposed for retention permission here did not reinforce the character and distinctiveness of the subject lands and materially contravened Objective GINHO60 (Protection of Views and Prospects) and GINHO67 (Development of High Amenity Areas).

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- 3.2.3. The Transportation Planning Section noted the requirements of 70m sightlines in both directions from a 2.4m setback from the edge of the road for a 50km speed limit (i.e., the speed limit of the road). Following a site visit it was noted that *“sightlines appear to measure in excess of 70m to the north from a 2.4m setback which would meet the requirements of TII DN-GEO-03060. However, sightlines to the south measure circa 51m which corresponds to a speed of circa 41 km/hr “*.

- 3.2.4. Notwithstanding this, the Section had regard to the nature of the road (alignment and gradient), nature of the proposed development (an agricultural access with limited movements) and width of the access and it had no in principle objection from a road safety perspective. If a grant of permission was being considered, the Section recommended the following:

- Any proposed intensification of the agricultural entrance would be subject to a separate planning application and a speed survey, and the results of a speed survey would be required to determine the 85% traffic speeds.
- The vehicular entry-splay (i.e. the paved area lying between the edge of road carriageway and the gate of the site entrance or, if no gate is provided, to a point 6.9m from the edge of road carriageway) shall be constructed in a bound road material or other suitable material to a detail approved by the Planning Authority.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

No prescribed body submissions received.

3.4. **Third Party Observations**

No third-party submissions received.

4.0 **Planning History**

Permission was granted for works to the main period dwelling (Ounavarra House) including works to an existing window and portico (Reg. Ref. FW17B/0012) and the construction of a single storey stone portico (Reg. Ref. FW16B/0109). In 2014, permission was also granted for a replacement Wastewater Treatment Plant and associated site development works (Reg. Ref. FW14A/0043).

Lands immediately adjoining the subject lands has been the subject of recent planning applications and related activity:

- **FW24A/0134 and ABP 319896-24:** A planning application by Tuthills Limited was REFUSED for retention of warehouse shed extension, garage, prefabricated office, concrete apron and storage container on a site immediately adjacent to the subject site. The decision of the Planning Authority was appealed to An Bord Pleanála who upheld the decision to refuse planning permission on the 4th of November 2024. The reasons for refusal related to the High Amenity (HA) zoning objective in the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and substandard nature of the local road.

- **FW24A/0145E and ABP 319993-24:** A planning application by Steven McEleney was REFUSED for retention of a concrete yard, site works above and below ground and for proposed surface water drainage infrastructure and soak pit on a site immediately adjacent to the subject site. The decision of the Planning Authority was appealed to An Bord Pleanála who upheld the decision to refuse planning permission on the 1st of November 2024. The reason for refusal related to the High Amenity (HA) zoning objective in the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029.
- **FW23A/0353:** An application made by Steven McEleney for construction a new single storey shed approximately 206.80 sqm over part of an existing yard and single storey building on a site immediately adjacent to the subject site was deemed to be WITHDRAWN.
- **ENF. 23-188B** An enforcement file is referred in the Planners Report as being currently active for the construction of commercial sheds, concrete yard and commercial activity
- **Section 5 Ref. FS5W/005/24** The provision of an agricultural shed measuring 256sqm at Ounavarra, Clonee Road, Lucan was considered to be exempt development.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

The Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029, adopted on the 22nd of February 2023, is the current statutory development plan for the subject site.

Under the Development Plan, the subject site is zoned 'HA' - High Amenity which seeks to *'protect and enhance high amenity areas'*. The stated vision for these areas is to *'Protect these highly sensitive and scenic locations from inappropriate development and reinforce their character, distinctiveness and sense of place. In recognition of the amenity potential of these areas opportunities to increase public access will be explored'*.

The site is also within the 'Highly Sensitive Landscape - Blanchardstown South' area, and as indicated on Sheet 13 Blanchardstown South 2023 – 2029, the section of roadway which runs along the front of the subject site along the Clonee Road (L3004), i.e., the location of the subject entrance, is identified for the preservation and protection of views and prospects.

Section 9.6.14 relates to Landscape Character Assessment. Relevant policy objectives include **Objective GINHO058** which relates to resisting developments which would interfere with the character of highly sensitive areas or with a view or prospect of special amenity value, which is necessary to preserve.

Objective GINHO59 seeks to ensure that new development does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of highly sensitive areas. It sets out that new development in highly sensitive areas shall not be permitted if it a) results in unacceptable visual harm, b) introduces incongruous elements and c) causes the disturbance or loss of (i and ii) landscape or elements that contribute to local distinctiveness or landscape character and quality such as field or road patterns, (iii) vegetation which is characteristic of that landscape type and (iv) the visual condition of the landscape.

Section 9.6.15 deals with the preservation of Views and Prospects. The Development Plan acknowledges the challenge being faced to manage the landscape so that any change is positive in its effects. Relevant policy objectives include

- Policy GINHP26 – Preservation of Views and Prospect which requires development to reflect and reinforces the distinctiveness and sense of place of High Amenity areas, including the retention of important features or characteristics:
- Objective GINHO60 – Protection of Views and Prospects Protect which requires the protection of views and prospects that contribute to the character of the landscape, particularly those identified in the Development Plan, from inappropriate development.

Section 9.6.17 relates to areas of the County identified of high landscape value and zoned accordingly i.e. HA. These *“consist of landscapes of special character in*

which inappropriate development would contribute to a significant diminution of landscape value in the County". Relevant policy objectives include:

- **Policy GINHP28** which relates to protecting high amenity areas from inappropriate development and reinforcing their character, distinctiveness and sense of place. Section 14.18.3 deals with Principles for Development for Landscapes.
- **Policy Objective GINHO67** seeks to ensure that development reflects the distinctiveness and sense of place of HA zoned areas, including the retention of important features or characteristics, taking into account the various elements which contribute to its distinctiveness such as geology and landform, habitats, scenic quality, settlement pattern, historic heritage, local vernacular heritage, land-use and tranquillity.

Section 14.15.5 relates to Development Management Standards for agricultural development. Relevant policies and objectives include.

- **Objective DMSO100** relates to the construction and layout of agricultural buildings and associated works (to include walls, gates, entrances and yards) requires that they be sited as unobtrusively as possible and sympathetic to their surroundings.
- **Objective DMSO102** relates to the assessment of agricultural development and in assessing the acceptability of buildings the extent to which they can be integrated into the landscape will be a relevant factor.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is located c.200m from Liffey Valley proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA) (site code 000128). Other designated areas include:

- The Royal Canal PNHA (site code 002103) is located 1.1km to the north,
- The Rye Water Valley / Carton Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and pNHA (site code 001398) is located 2.2km to the west
- The Grand Canal pNHA (site code 002104) is located 3.1km to the south
- Lugmore Glen pNHA (site code 001212) is located 10.2km away

- Slade of Saggart and Crooksling Glen PNHA (site code 000211) is located 10.3km away
- Dodder Valley PNHA (site code 000991) is 11km away.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

In response to Refusal Reason No. 1 - Interference with the Character of the Landscape and Protected Views (GINHO60), the Applicant / Appellant sets out:

- The entrance has been carefully constructed using materials salvaged from the original boundary wall, ensuring visual continuity and harmony with the surrounding environment. It is unobtrusively sited by hedgerows, making it blend seamlessly into the existing landscape.
- The entrance is scarcely visible from public roads, ensuring interfere with protected views.
- The entrance is necessary to maintain agricultural operations that are critical for the upkeep of the high-amenity landscape, which directly supports the zoning objective of preserving and enhancing the area's character.

In response to Refusal Reason No. 2 – Impact on a Highly Sensitive Landscape and Loss of Vegetation (GINHO59 and GINHO58), the Applicant / Appellant sets out:

- It was acknowledged that a tree fell in 2021, causing damage to the boundary wall but no significant additional vegetation was removed during the construction of the entrance. Hedgerows have been replanted to restore the landscape, ensuring that the area remains in line with the high-amenity designation.
- The entrance does not introduce incongruous elements into the landscape, and its scale is entirely appropriate for the agricultural use of the land.
- The development aligns with the objectives of maintaining the landscapes ecological health and visual integrity.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

The main points of the response by Fingal County Council dated 4th November 2024 reiterated points made in the Planners Report relating to HA zoning objective, and within lands classified as 'Highly Sensitive landscape: Blanchardstown South' with an objective to preserve views at the entrance of the subject site

- In building the entrance and removing the trees the applicant caused damage to the Protected Views and disregarded the objective assigned to the lands.
- The applicant has failed to justify the need for an alternative entrance and its scale in relation to the agricultural works being carried out on the site.
- Agricultural developments are required to be sensitive to their surroundings and the works proposed do not reinforce the character and distinctiveness of the subject lands and therefore materially contravenes Objectives GINHO60 and GINHO 67 of the Development Plan.

6.3. Further Responses

The Applicant / Appellant submitted a response to Fingal County Council's observation on 2nd December 2024. It included photographs and drawings. The main points were as follows:

- The proposed entrance is critical for the effective management and operation of Ounavarra, directly supporting the 'High Amenity' zoning objective by facilitating agricultural activities essential to preserving the rural character, ecological integrity and distinctiveness of the landscape. Its design including the use of salvaged materials from the original wall and purpose align fully with the Fingal County Development Plan, reinforcing the sites sense of place and maintaining its high-amenity value.
- There is no material before the Board to substantiate the assertions made as to the occurrence of commercial activity and the removal of trees.
- The entrance is vital for maintaining agricultural use including livestock management, landscape maintenance and ensuring access for large

machinery, and complies with all relevant zoning objectives and is designed to minimise its impact on the landscape while meeting safety requirements.

- The subject entrance is the only feasible option as no alternative viable access exists. Previously, access was via an adjacent laneway; however, this is no longer possible due to the laneways separate ownership. Internal access from the existing residential driveway is impractical as it is impeded by substantial topographical challenges, low ESB overhead powerlines, mature tree and heritage fencing.

7.0 EIA Screening

- 7.1.1. See completed Form 1 and Form 2 on file. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

8.0 Assessment

- 8.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the reports of the Local Authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development, Policy and Visual Impact.

- 8.1.2. While I note various matters raised by both the Applicant / First Party Appellant and the Council through the application and appeal process relating to how and why the entrance came into being – be it as a result of storm damage and the falling down of trees or whether new / additional tree and/or hedgerow removal was required to facilitate the access; it nevertheless remain the case that the entrance has been constructed and its retention is sought.

- 8.1.3. In respect of traffic, I note the comments of the Transportation Planning Section of the Planning Authority. I agree that notwithstanding the fact that the sightlines to the south are less than the required, having regard to the nature of the road (alignment

and gradient), nature of the proposed development (an agricultural access with limited movements) and width of the access, the entrance would not raise any road safety concerns. I consider that should all other aspects of the development be acceptable, the planning conditions recommended by the Transportation Planning Section could be applied to a grant of planning permission.

Principle of Development, Policy and Visual Impact

- 8.1.4. The stated intention for the new vehicular entrance is as an agricultural entrance necessary to maintain agricultural use including livestock management, landscape maintenance and ensuring access for large machinery to the north-eastern field (to the front of the house).
- 8.1.5. While it is evident the field in question could be utilised for modest farming activities, and the applicant does provide an Annual Maintenance Landscape Schedule prepared by AYG Landscape Consultants relating to overall landholding, I consider the level of agricultural upkeep, given the size of both the overall landholding and the north-eastern field in particular, to be overstated.
- 8.1.6. I also note the Applicants / Appellants argument that the subject entrance is the only feasible location that enables them to access the agricultural lands. However, these lands have been accessible previously by other means. Regarding the existing access / driveway to the main house, while there may be some justification as to why it may not be suitable for large agricultural machinery, the extent to which access for more modest machinery is not set out – in this regard, access is still required to maintain the meadows and wooded areas to the western side of the house.
- 8.1.7. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider insufficient information is provided relating to agricultural vehicular access and movement requirements throughout the landholding (to include the north-eastern field) to support the stated agricultural and maintenance activity requirements. I therefore do not consider the applicant has demonstrated sufficient justification for an additional entrance of the scale proposed, to enable some level of farming / maintenance activities on the subject lands.
- 8.1.8. The next matter is to determine whether the entrance as currently constructed meets other policies and objectives of the development plan.

- 8.1.9. The Development Plan accepts the need for agricultural buildings and associated works to serve rural sites, but such developments are required to be sympathetic to their surroundings as per Objective DMS0100 and well-integrated within the landscape as per Objective DMS0102.
- 8.1.10. This requirement is even more important in the context of lands being zoned objective 'HA' – High Amenity and the fact that the sensitivity of this particular section of roadway (i.e., along the frontage of this particular property) is also specifically covered by an objective to preserve views and prospects.
- 8.1.11. The proposed development is promoted as a new agricultural vehicular entrance and as such policy Objective DMSO100 and Objective DMSO102 are relevant. These require agricultural works to be sited as unobtrusively as possible, be sympathetic to their surroundings, and integrate into the landscape.
- 8.1.12. The piers at the entrance measure 2.35m high x .80 - .82m wide and are connected by a wall to second inner set of gate piers measuring 2.16m x .80 - .82m. The width of the entrance (inclusive of piers) is 10.2m along the public road. The width of the gate opening is 7.18m.
- 8.1.13. This stature of both sets of piers is a striking visual feature. As you approach from the east, the entrance is positioned on the brow of an incline and both sets of piers breach the skyline, further contributing to the impressive nature of the gateway. While recent hedge planting does provide some screening on approach, nevertheless it does not address the scale of the opening itself and its associated architecture. The view is all the more notable because as you approach from either the east or west, your view is drawn to the open country. The sensitivity of this particular section of roadway (i.e., along the frontage of this particular property) is specifically acknowledged by the objective to preserve views and prospects in this exact location. Whether it was the trees (some of which are no longer in evidence) along this section of the road or the views of open countryside - the views along this section contribute to the character of the landscape, remain highly sensitive to development and should be protected from inappropriate development.
- 8.1.14. I consider that the scale and character of the entrance not to be agricultural in nature, rather it is more typical of a statement entrance to a dwelling evident in an urban / suburban context. This is compounded by it being significantly wider than a

typical dwelling entrance; indeed, the inner gate width is similar to a Type 1 single carriageway road (which has a total width of 7.30m). Having regard to the foregoing I consider it neither unobtrusive nor does it integrate into the landscape as required by Objective DMSO100 and Objective DMSO102.

- 8.1.15. Furthermore, of particular concern is the highly sensitive nature of the area which is actively protected by Objective GINHO58 and Objective GINHO59 and Objective GINHO58 which relates to resisting developments which would interfere with the character of highly sensitive areas or with a view or prospect of special amenity value, which is necessary to preserve. Whereas Objective GINHO59 seeks to ensure that new development does not impinge in any significant way on the character, integrity and distinctiveness of highly sensitive areas. These objectives rightly set a very high bar for any development within the area.
- 8.1.16. While there is an existing low wall running along the boundary of the site with the L3004, and I acknowledge some use of salvaged material (from the damaged wall) which does attempt to be sympathetic, the open stonework and capping nevertheless further contributes to the scale and massing of the piers (in particular) and ultimately the sense of the urbanisation / suburbanisation of the area.
- 8.1.17. Furthermore, having regard to the nature of the L3004 along this section, the addition of another large entrance between the main entrance to the house and access to the private laneway, and the style of the entrance further erodes the rural character of the area.
- 8.1.18. In summary, I consider that the subject entrance fails to be unobtrusive, sympathetic to its surroundings, or integrate into the landscape as required by Objective DMSO100 and Objective DMSO102. Having regard to the manner in which it impinges on the landscape and character and integrity of the area I consider it to materially contravene Objectives GINHO59 and GINHO58 of the Development Plan.
- 8.1.19. Furthermore, because of the specific views along the site boundary at this location which are identified for preservation, I also consider that the works proposed for retention materially contravenes objective GINHO60 and GINHO67 of the Development Plan.

- 8.2. Granting planning permission would establish a poor precedent and would be contrary to the interests of HA High Amenity land use zoning assigned to subject lands.

Material Contravention Issue

- 8.2.1. The Planning Authority considered in its refusal reasons that the development materially contravenes Objective GINHO67 and the 'HA' zoning objective for the site and that Objectives GINHO59 and GINHO58 are materially contravened given the impacts on the landscape and character of the area. I agree that a material contravention of these objectives of the Development Plan arises for the reasons outlined above having regard to the nature and scale of the development in terms of significant lack of consistency with the vision of the zoning objective for the site and impacts on the landscape character of the area.
- 8.2.2. As the Planning Authority decided to refuse permission, under Section 37 (2) (b) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) because the development materially contravenes the development plan, the Board may only grant permission where it considers that one of the following circumstances of Section 37 (2) (b) apply:
- I. the proposed development is of strategic or national importance,
 - II. there are conflicting objectives in the development plan, or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned, or
 - III. permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to regional planning guidelines for the area, guidelines under section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the Government, the Minister or any Minister of the Government, or
 - IV. permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan.

- 8.2.3. I have reviewed these criteria and I do not consider that the development meets the criteria as it is clearly not of strategic or national importance given its scale and type; there are no conflicting objectives in the development plan or objectives which are not clearly stated in relation to the development; the RSES, the Section 28 Guidelines, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of the Council, and Government policies do not require or provide for such type of development in a rural area; and the pattern of development, and permissions granted in the area since the making of the development plan do not provide precedent or support for the granting of permission in this case. It is thus not recommended that the Board considers granting permission using the material contravention powers open to it.

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.2.2km from the Rye Water Valley / Carton Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and PNHA (site code 001398) to the west.
- 9.2. The proposed development comprises the retention of an agricultural entrance and associated works.
- 9.3. 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 appreciable effect on a European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The small scale and limited footprint of the development,
 - The location of the development down river from the above SAC and the nature of intervening habitats which are agricultural and partly urban.
 - Taking into account the screening determination carried out by Fingal County Council.
- 9.4. I consider that the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect individually, or in-combination with other plans and projects, on a European Site and appropriate assessment is therefore not required.

10.0 Recommendation

I recommend that the planning application be refused for the following reasons and considerations.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development is located within an area zoned 'HA' (High Amenity) and which is identified as a highly sensitive landscape in the Fingal Development Plan 2023 – 2029 and on a section of road with the objective for the preservation and protection of views and prospects. The new vehicular entrance, by virtue of its scale and nature is an overly suburban/urban in nature serves to erode the rural landscape character of the area. The proposed development does not therefore accord with the vision of the zoning of the site which seeks to protect such highly sensitive and scenic locations from inappropriate development and to reinforce their character. Retention of the proposed development therefore materially contravenes the 'HA' land use zoning objective and Objectives GINHO58, GINHO59 and GINHO67 of the Fingal Development Plan 2023-2029. The proposed development is, therefore, contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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.

Leah Kenny

Planning Inspector

28th March 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321008-24		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of an agricultural entrance and associated site works		
Development Address	Ounavarra, Clonee Road, Lucan, Co. Dublin K78 HP90		
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	✓
		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	✓	The development is of a Class (Class 1(a) – Schedule 2) - Projects for the restructuring of rural land holdings, undertaken as part of a wider proposed development, and not as an agricultural activity that must comply with the European Communities (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Agriculture) Regulations 2011,	Proceed to Q3.
No			Tick if relevant. 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	✓	The relevant threshold for Class 1(a) – Schedule 2 is <i>"Where the length of field boundary to be removed is above 4 kilometres"</i>	Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	✓	As the development is already in existence, and retention is sought it is not possible to determine the exact length of field boundary that has been removed. However, taking account for the width of the entrance	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

		(10m) and making allowance for the potential removal additional removal field boundary / hedgerow either side will have been significantly below the “4 kilometres” threshold.	
--	--	--	--

5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?		
No	✓	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)
Yes	Tick/or leave blank	Screening Determination required

Inspector: _____

Date: 28th March 2025

Leah Kenny

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference Number	ABP-321008-24
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of an agricultural entrance and associated site works
Development Address	Ounavarra, Clonee Road, Lucan, Co. Dublin K78 HP90
<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).	A new vehicular entrance measuring 10m wide (resulting in the loss of section of hedgerow) is not inconsistent with its rural context and will not result in significant use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).

<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be 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).</p>	<p>The application in a rural context, removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites, and there are no Protected Structures in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Notwithstanding issues relating to visual impact in this sensitive landscape and issues relating to policy, I do not consider that there is potential for the proposed development to significantly negatively affect environmental sensitivities in the area.</p>
<p>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>The site is in a rural location. A single vehicular entrance is not likely to give rise to any significant impacts locally.</p>

Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	No
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.	

Inspector: _____ Date: 28th March 2025
Leah Kenny

DP/ADP:

Date: