



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321470-24

Development	Retention of a machinery and hay store and associated works.
Location	Colla , Schull, Co. Cork.
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24/310
Applicant(s)	Patrick Murphy
Type of Application	Permission to Retain
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Patrick Murphy
Observer(s)	Oonagh Buckley Kevin Murray Anthony and Valerie Payne Margaret Newcombe Chloe Payne Murphy

Eimer Horgan

Mary Murphy

Margaret O'Sullivan

Date of Site Inspection

13th February 2024

Inspector

Suzanne Kehely

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site of 0.12ha is part of a cumulative 25 hectare holding (as outlined in blue in the submitted plans) and is located in a rural coastal area 3.6km by road from Schull main street. It is with a greenbelt area. The proposed development site is in the townland of Colla and relates to a suckler farm (20 suckler cows and 4 cattle aged over 6months) which also generates 300 bales of hay. The site is in an elevated hillside setting in the vicinity of a residential enclave of low-density housing surrounded by agricultural/grazing lands. It is accessed via a private road which is a cul-de-sac and provides access to around 8 dwellings and there is a track from this road to the applicant's landholding.
- 1.2. At time of inspection there was large shed in the north west corner set against an embankment to the north. Silage bales were stored 3 stacks high (or 2.5 taking account of the wedged pyramid-style format) between the shed and the boundary to the south. The eastern frontage was open, and the yard area was partly hardcore and partly concrete. There was evidence of rubble and potentially deleterious material along the inside of the southern boundary hedgerow and also behind the silage bale stack. Views were available inside the shed, and it was used for stacking hay and also storage of farm machinery and harvesting type equipment.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The development subject of retention consists of the existing shed/hay barn with a 128sq.m. floor space. The site layout plans include a silage bale storage area and a soakaway together with proposed landscaping of southern and northern boundaries with clusters of whitethorn, rowan and holly to the north in addition to birch and oak trees to the north west and native shrub mix to the south.
- 2.2. The grounds of appeal include an agricultural consultant report explaining the purpose of the shed is to maintain safe operations and viability of this modest family farm. The report includes a map as per the BISS 24 application and shows the holding of two tracts of land separated by 1km. The subject site is part of Block B where there are no sheds, whereas Block A to the west, has the existing sheds and yard. The site layout of this is appended to the submissions.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

3.1.1. By Order dated 22nd November 2024 the planning authority (PA) issued a notification of decision to refuse to Grant Permission for one reason incorporating multiple issues:

- Visual impact in a High Value Landscape
- Impact of landscape character
- Proximity to and Impact on residential amenities and
- Insufficient need demonstrated for the scale of the shed and agricultural need in the context of the land holding.
- Not satisfied that it is not solely for agricultural use.
- Therefore the development to be retained would be a material contravention.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports:

- The enforcement history for the subject development is set out and refers to matters in 2022 following complaints and no evidence of a section 5 application. It is submitted to be clearly not exempt due to breach of setback distances from residences for such exemption.
- Notes the localised residential character and absence of large agricultural buildings in the immediate area which is set in a wider rural and scenic context.
- The proposed shed is considered to be out of scale and character with the immediate residential environs and character. 4 dwellings within 100m.
- Justification for the shed having regard to scale and its location removed from the applicant's yard and also having regard to what is considered to be non-agriculture use.

- The planning history is cited in respect of the applicant's holding wherein it is calculated that they could have up to 400sq.m. of storage which is excessive for 24 cattle based on a rate of 16 sq.m of storage space per head.
- The basis for the 22/2 application for storage was the proximity to the landholding 1km to the east whereas now the case is that that the subject shed is 1km from the land holding to the west.
- Acknowledges concern about intensification of farm traffic on a private road
- A number of cases are cited where permission was refused for similar development on grounds of justification.
- Refers to ownership and lack of documentary evidence of claims.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Area Engineer:

- No objection subject to conditions.

Environment: This is a detailed report which:

- Notes the nature and scale of farming
- Sets out the EPA mapping data on soils and hydrology and notes the site and development features in this regard. (Uncontaminated rainwater to soak pit, the nearest dwelling at 25m and mains water in the area, no watercourse within 60m.)
- Cites specification standards for bovine livestock units and reinforced tanks nutrient loading and stocking capacity [but this is not I consider relevant in light of the nature of the proposal.]
- Concludes no objection subject to 15 conditions which include conditions in relation to
 - no farm animals to be accommodated I the rpospeod building
 - restriction bale stacking
 - plastic packaging disposal
 - fuel storage
 - control of nuisance emissions (odour dust noise) and vermin

- condition 13 states the building to be used for hay and straw only and the this shall be stored within the confines of the building

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

No responses

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. Four observations objecting to the shed were submitted and considered by the planning authority. The issues are reiterated in the objecting observations on the appeal and relate to: proximity to residential property, height and visual impact, loss of views, engine noise, justification and alleged non-agricultural storage, ownership, pest infestation, depreciation of property and impact on road paid for residents.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. The applicant's landholding c.1km from site:

- PA Ref 22/002 refers to permission for farm building at the applicant yard in a separate landholding. Drawings of site layout were submitted to the Board on 13th January 2025.
- An Bord Pleanála PL88.242912 refers to refusal of permission in 2014 for a dwelling on lands to south of the applicant's landholding east of the subject development site. Reasons were based on maintaining the green belt, visual obtrusiveness, discouraging new houses in scenic coastal areas and pollution risk notwithstanding proprietary effluent treatment system.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP)

The CDP sets out objectives pertaining to sustainable agriculture, visual amenity in sensitive landscapes road safety and biodiversity and environment and these are cited in detail in the planner's report. Of note:

- The site is located in a Town Greenbelt. Volume 1 Section 5.5.4 sets out governing principles of greenbelt policy generally, such as, inter alia, maintaining the clear distinction between urban areas and the countryside, retention of land in agriculture and provide for appropriate land uses that protect the physical and visual amenity of the area. Section 5.5.9 refers to greenbelt around other towns and states in section 5.5.12 that 'within these greenbelts land is generally reserved for agriculture open space or recreations
- Objective RP 5-19: Greenbelts around Settlements, seeks to "Retain the identity of towns, to prevent sprawl, and to ensure a distinction in character between built up areas and the open countryside by maintaining a Greenbelt around all individual towns. (b) Reserve generally for use as agriculture, open space or recreation uses those lands that lie in the immediate surroundings of towns. Where Natura 2000 sites, Natural Heritage Areas, proposed Natural Heritage Areas and other areas of biodiversity value occur within Greenbelts, these shall be reserved for uses compatible with their nature conservation designation and biodiversity value. (c) Prevent linear roadside frontage development on the roads leading out of towns and villages."
- RP 5-20: Greenbelts around Main Towns
- GB 1-1: Discourage strongly new individual housing from being located within the greenbelts around the Maim towns.'
- The policy for Agriculture and Farm Diversification is set out in section 8.16. 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. **Objective EC8-15** applies: Subsection (a) seeks to 'Encourage the development of sustainable agriculture and related infrastructure including farm buildings.'
- The site is within an area designated as "High Value Landscape".
- Colla Road L4407 from which the private access road is accessed is a designated scenic route (S100) Route between Schull and Colla.

- Green Infrastructure - Amenity objectives include, GI 14-12, 14-13 and of particular note are Objectives **GI 14-10** regarding minimising visual and environmental impact in High Value Landscape and **GI14-9** regarding “Landscape” wherein, it is a stated objective to:
 - Protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork’s built and natural environment.
 - Landscape issues will be an important factor in all land-use proposals, ensuring that a proactive view of development is undertaken while protecting the environment and heritage generally in line with the principle of sustainability.
 - Ensure that new development meets high standards of siting and design.
 - Protect skylines and ridgelines from development.
 - Discourage proposals necessitating the removal of extensive amounts of trees, hedgerows and historic walls or their distinctive boundary treatments.
- **BE 15-13: Noise and Light Emissions** a) Seek the minimisation and control of noise pollution associated with activities or development, having regard to relevant standards, published guidance and the receiving environment. b) Ensure noise-sensitive developments are adequately protected from potential sources of noise (e.g. national roads). New developments should take account of, and mitigate against, any existing noise sources. c) Support the implementation of Noise Action Plans prepared for the Cork County area. d) Seek the minimisation and control of light pollution associated with activities of development, having regard to relevant standards, published guidance and the receiving environment and Dark Sky principles. e) Review and update Cork County Council Policy Guidelines for Public Lighting to take account of impacts of public lighting on wildlife and night skies

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The site is not located within or adjacent to a protected site. The nearest sites are:

- Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC Site code 00101 is c.270m to the south
- Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC Site Code: 001040 is c7.5km west.

- Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA (Site Code: 004156) is over 10km to the north west on the other side of the peninsula.

5.3. Statutory Management Requirements for farmers are set down by the Department of Agriculture Food and the Marine and based on European Directives and set out rules for silage bale storage . Of relevance are:

- **SMR 1** Statutory Management Requirements protection of water against pollution caused by nitrates
- **SMR 2** Statutory Management Requirements for Conservation of Wild Birds .

6.0 Water Framework Directive

- 6.1. The European Union Water Framework Directive (WFD) aims to improve water quality and applies to all water bodies. Member States are required to achieve 'good' status in all waters and must ensure that status does not deteriorate.
- 6.2. The development site is in an elevated rural coastal area surrounded by pastureland and intermittent dispersed housing. There is no watercourse within or in the immediate vicinity of the site. The coastal waters of Roaringwater Bay are within 300m of the site.
- 6.3. The nearest river as mapped on the EPA maps is over 200m away and forms part of Lowertown_010 catchment as part of the larger Bandon-Ilen catchment which discharges to the Roaringwater Bay. The hydrological connection is only possible through groundwater with a consequent potential indirect impact on the Roaringwater Bay coastal waterbody.
- 6.4. The proposed development comprises retention of a dry store for machinery and hay and does not provide for livestock. Silage bales is an ongoing activity for 18 years and is shown to be retained but this subject to correct stacking in line with Good Agricultural Practice and does not in these circumstances pose a risk.
- 6.5. Water quality concerns are raised in general terms by one neighbouring resident in terms of proximity to well and deleterious material seeping to the ground water.

- 6.6. From the EPA website I note the chemical composition flagged in the wider catchment that the overall ecological status is good. Lowertown_10 has good status both chemically and ecologically. In terms of agricultural land and impact on water quality I note a White Flag status which indicates no present risk to water quality posed by the agricultural lands in the area.
- 6.7. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the WFD 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 there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 6.8. The reason for this conclusion is based primarily on:
- The scale of works and nature of development which does not involve livestock and
 - the silage storage which is required to be stored in compliance with the GAP,
- 6.9. Conclusion: I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed 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. (Refer to Appendix 4 for screening matrix).

7.0 EIA Screening

- 7.1. The development is not of a type listed under Schedule 5, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 as amended. The need for an environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required. (Refer to Appendix 1 for Preliminary Examination.)

8.0 The Appeal

8.1. Grounds of Appeal

An agent has submitted grounds of appeal on behalf of the applicant. The following points are made in supporting a decision to grant permission having regard to both the reason for refusal and the observation to the PA:

- The established agricultural use of the road by the applicant's family over generations predates the housing dating from 1960s and 1970 when it was widened to accommodate the traffic.
- Disagrees that residential amenity is unduly impacted in this context and that it is in a greenbelt outside a designated settlement area and also by the fact that
 - the traffic will be reduced.
 - In terms of public health and nuisance the internal storing of hay bales and grain inside a sealed shed will reduce pest infestation
 - Silage bales have been stored on site without issue for 18 years
- The development of hay/machinery storage shed provides sheltered storage in a coastal area where there is inevitable rusting from sea salt.
- It is necessary for the functioning of the established family farm (for generations) which is sustainable non-intensive beef farming with a low stocking rate.
- Storage for hay avoids need for plastics.
- It is unavoidable to live in a rural area without some agricultural impacts.
- While acknowledging a discrepancy in landholding maps, it is submitted 'there is no doubting that the subject site is part of the applicant's landholding and has been farmed by him and his family for many decades.
- Its nature and scale are appropriate to an established farm.
- It is intended to complete the landscaping as recommended in the CCC Environment report.
- It would not be visually obtrusive or injure amenities in the area
- No material impact on the road network – no traffic hazard – the shed at this location will reduce agricultural traffic par. 1.2
Would be acceptable in terms of public health and environmental sustainability.

8.2. Planning Authority Response

- 8.2.1. In a letter to the Board received on 27th January 2025 the PA reaffirms its decision to refuse permission and notes that the applicant has not yet confirmed details of land ownership which has been questioned by both the PA and the residents. The discrepancy in the land registry suggests that the applicant cannot meet with the obligation under Art 22.
- 8.2.2. It is noted that the lands outlined in blue in the recent and subject application is inconsistent
- 8.2.3. The PA is vociferous in its claims of unauthorised use such as predominant storage of domestic recreational equipment/vehicles including boats, cars, go-kart and is not being used for the purposes stated. It is explained how based on this experience and giving notice of inspection and concealment of content that it is simply does not have the resources for managing compliance and monitoring conditions and that there are thousands of such sheds in the county. The justification of need for such storage is questioned again in the context of the extant sheds in the wider holding and in what is perceived, in a manner, as a cynical attempt to obfuscate the actual use.

8.3. Observations

- 8.3.1. A total of 8 observation are made.
- 8.3.2. The following points are against permission for the retention of the shed:
- It is now a residential area through which the applicant is allowed access his land
 - Of the 4 nearest dwellings, 2 are full-time residents. All houses have permission
 - Injury of residential amenity due to noise and disturbance from engines
 - Damage to road which has been maintained by and at expense of residents
 - Generating non-farm related traffic
 - Site layout map does not include all surrounding residences.
 - Historical agriculture use was with walking/ cart and horse as transport
 - Since construction of the shed there has been no reduction in farm traffic nor has the applicant been observing walking along the road or using a quad bike.

- Shed is not being used for agricultural purposes such as for heavy agricultural machinery for lifting bales. The storage of a small tractor no longer in use is viewed as cynical attempt to get permission for non-agricultural use - Concern about change of use given the lack of perceived need.
- The soakaway is 50m from neighbours well rather than the required 60m.
- Storage of silage bales for 18 years is irrelevant given the stack height.
- Hay bales are stored outside.
- The applicant has destroyed the natural habitat.
- Industrial nature of large windowless shed visually detracts from area.
- The applicant is a hobby farmer and primarily a builder. The site is used for old machinery and builder's waste associated with the applicant's building business. Evidence of strewn about site silage bales conceal a dumped vehicle concern about rust and pollution from this.
- Possible encroachment on neighbours land as that owner is in Canada.
- The shed is existing and cannot be described as proposed.
- Photographs appended illustrating site use.

8.3.3. The following points are made in support of a grant of permission

- The houses are relatively recent.
- The applicant is recognised as part of intergenerational local farming family (5th generation) who works hard.
- Recognises the shed is a practical facility serving lands and will reduce traffic.
- It is not visible from the public road.
- The site is in an agricultural rural area.
- The applicant farms in a sustainable manner.
- The applicant employs his sons in the farming enterprise thereby sustaining the use for the next generation.
- Only 2 of the 4 objectors live in the adjacent houses while majority of houses on road are holiday homes. Most residents do not object.
- Recognise need for shelter against harsh West Cork climate.
- The shed is part of a normal working agricultural landscape.

- Objections regarding traffic are misplaced as the applicant actively farms lands anyway from his farm base in Colla Pier. arguably there could be less traffic with the shed at this location.

9.0 **Assessment**

9.1. **Issues**

9.1.1. Having reviewed 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 policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are:

- Principle of development
- justification of need
- Impact on visual amenity and landscape character
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on environment
- Traffic safety
- Material contravention
- Other Issues
- Appropriate Assessment id s mandatory consideration addressed in the next section.

9.2. **Principle of Development**

9.2.1. The applicant is seeking retention of a 128sq.m. shed in part of his land which is in two main clusters which support a low stocked farm of beef livestock. The stated activities include baling hay, transporting and storing both livestock and hay as part of the farming operations. The main yard is about 1km away, however the subject site is in close proximity to the other tract of land marked B in the submitted details. It is stated to be for the purposes of storage of hay and farm related machinery but not for the purpose of storing livestock and/or associated effluent.

- 9.2.2. The site is located in a greenbelt area surrounding Schull town. In such areas the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028(CDP) seeks to restrict development with a two-fold aim of both directing settlement into towns and containing them while also protecting the rural character. Section 5.5.12 of the CDP states that ‘within these greenbelts land is generally reserved for agriculture, open space or recreation uses.’
- 9.2.3. Objective RP 5-19 specifically states in relation to Greenbelts around Settlements that in addition to protecting the open character it aims in sub-section (b) to **‘Reserve generally for use as agriculture, open space or recreation uses those lands that lie in the immediate surroundings of towns.’** Objective EC8-15 also supports sustainable farming. Subsection (a) states ‘Encourage the development of sustainable agriculture and related infrastructure including farm buildings.’
- 9.2.4. In view of the policy generally predisposed to supporting agricultural use in greenbelt areas and where the applicant is seeking retention of a shed stated to be for ancillary agricultural use of his lands which are removed from the main yard, the retention of a shed is I consider acceptable in principle in the context of the CDP aims and objectives. Although permission is predicated on meeting detailed criteria in respect of protecting environment (EC-13 (c) refers) and landscape character in proximity of a scenic route and in an area of high visual landscape character and according with overall proper planning and sustainable development.

9.3. **Justification of need**

- 9.3.1. The PA and objecting parties hold the view that the proposed retention is unacceptable at the location as the shed is not being used primarily for hay and farm machinery but is being used for personal storage of cars and a boat. It is further submitted that the existing yard adjacent to the applicant’s home to the west has sufficient storage to cater for the actual uses. In view of the injury to amenity a demonstrable need beyond that presently exhibited by the applicant is considered necessary by both the PA and the objectors.
- 9.3.2. In terms of farm machinery the objectors make the case that it is being used for non-farming whereas the applicant disputes this and explains that there is a need for waterproof storage for farm machinery that is for adjacent lands in the family. These

lands are highlighted by the applicant to include more visually exposed areas. There was no evidence of non-farming use during my site inspection. I see no reason in principle to refuse permission on the basis of an anticipated other use. I consider the applicant has made a reasonable case such that the proposal is acceptable in principle.

- 9.3.3. In view of the acceptable nature of the development in principle and having regard to my observations on site it is evident that the applicant is using the shed for activities generally as stated. While I note the enforcement action and submissions regarding non-agricultural uses, I consider the main basis for consideration can only be the nature of the uses as described by the applicant and as observed during my inspection. A deviation from this is a matter for enforcement and I do not consider it reasonable to refuse permission on the basis of anticipated use or the resource limitations of the planning authority in its management of matters of compliance. However good practice is to ensure that conditions of permission are enforceable and not unduly onerous on the planning authority. Accordingly, while not normally advisable it is an option to permit temporary permission. This will facilitate an opportunity for the planning authority to review the merits of the case based on the circumstances and standards of a future date. It would allow the applicant to further demonstrate the bona fides of his need for the development. In view of the circumstances of the case I consider this to be a reasonable approach for all parties.
- 9.3.4. In my opinion, in the event of a grant of permission, conditions can be reasonably attached restricting the use of the building to farming only. I recommend for clarity that the applicant be requested to submit details of the landholding to which the machinery is ancillary.

9.4. Ownership

- 9.4.1. There is a question of ownership of lands particularly given the discrepancy between the landholding details in the history file compared with that indicated in the subject file. The applicant acknowledges a discrepancy but in the opinion of PA fails to provide sufficient evidence of legal interest. In this regard a temporary permission would give concerned parties time to update land registry details and accurately conveyed boundaries. While the applicant has not submitted land registry maps nor

have the objectors in their refutations. Further information in this regard could be a slow process. Having regard to the limitations on the carrying out of development as provided for in s.34 (13) of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 as amended, I am satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated sufficient interest for the purposes of making a planning application. Permission alone does not entitle an applicant to carry out development. In the event of dispute this is matter for separate legal processes to determine.

9.5. Impact on visual amenity and landscape character

- 9.5.1. The site is located in an area classed as High Value Landscape and Colla Road - a local coastal road from which the site is set back over 300m is designated as a scenic route in the CDP. The PA consider the shed by reason of scale and its utilitarian design and siting amid houses to be visually dominant and oppressive in its impact on the landscape. This in part is the basis of refusal having regard to the CDP GI objectives as cited.
- 9.5.2. While I accept the CDP landscape policy context, I consider the fact that the structure is sited in a hillside setting against a partial back drop of rising land and trees,(which will be augmented), together with the already altered landscape by way of semi-urbanisation associated with the multiple dwellings, that the intrinsic landscape character would not be unduly altered.
- 9.5.3. Furthermore, having regard to the setback and intervening terrain and development between the scenic route and the site I do not consider the proposal to materially impact on the views from the designated scenic route.
- 9.5.4. Having regard to the terrain, the visual impact is localised and while obviously visible from nearby dwellings I consider it an acceptable visual intrusion by reference to the CDP policy of supporting agricultural development. The landholding intended to be served by the shed is, in the main, in a more exposed location and visually prominent from the coastal road and siting in such a location while agricultural in character, would I consider, be more obtrusive with potential to adversely detract from the visually amenities of the area. I consider the statement that the shed is in

one of the least exposed areas in this tract of land is plausible and therefore is least visible from the wider environs.

- 9.5.5. In terms of localised amenity and orderly development I consider the site would benefit from landscaping and boundary treatment. I note in particular the storage of debris and potentially deleterious material which should be removed as the retention of this would be inconsistent with the orderly development of the area and unacceptable, in terms of amenities.
- 9.5.6. The additional planting of deciduous indigenous species will further visually assimilate the building.
- 9.5.7. Accordingly, I do not consider the shed, subject to conditions, constitutes a material alteration of the landscape character to the extent that that it would undermine the high value landscape, nor would it in my judgement, unduly detract from the visual amenities of the area. Accordingly, it would not impinge on the preservation of the scenic route as designated along the Colla Road between Colla and Schull. In these circumstances it does not in my judgement conflict with objective GI 14-9 or GI 14-10 in respect of Landscape as contained in the CDP. Accordingly, I do not consider there are reasonable grounds to refuse permission on the basis of loss of landscape character or serious injury to visual amenities. However in the context of s.37 restrictions in granting permission on appeal, where the PA has refused on grounds of material contravention, this matter is considered further under the heading material contravention below.

9.6. Impact on Residential amenity

- 9.6.1. The key issue in this case is that the immediate surrounding land notwithstanding the greenbelt designation and settlement strategy, has a cluster of houses along the cul-de-sac road and in close proximity which based on the submissions are used both as permanent homes and holiday homes. The PA has taken the position that protection of residential amenity is paramount and overrides the need to support farming activities at this location. The PA holds the view that that the retention of the shed will have a detrimental impact on residential amenity in so far as the development constitutes a visual intrusion as viewed from surrounding residential

properties. One observing party I note has submitted photography of the intrusion of a private view. However, the CDP objective in regard to protecting scenic views is not relevant in so far as they relate to public and not private views. In light of the policy to support agricultural use in a green belt area outside a designated settlement area I do not consider it reasonable to refuse permission on grounds of loss or injury to a private view. The shed will not materially impact in terms of overshadowing or loss of day light or sunlight given the separation distances. Any overbearing impact is I consider off-set by the panoramic views and boundary planting.

- 9.6.2. It is further argued that it is unwarranted given the extant structures and scale of holding. I have addressed the wider landscape impacts above.
- 9.6.3. On balance I do not consider the proposal to be unduly incongruous with the pattern of development to the extent that it seriously injures visual amenities of this predominantly agricultural area.
- 9.6.4. It is further submitted that the proposed development constitutes a nuisance by reason of noise and dust and vermin. Much of this is based on the experience of engine noise which is based on allegedly non-agriculture use domestic use. Of note is that the site has been used for storage of baled silage. While there will be some intensification associated with additional storage, I consider that subject to good practice which can be embedded in conditions of permission, this is a reasonable development for an established farm. Accordingly, I do not consider the proposed development is likely to unduly detract from residential amenities in this agricultural area. It also provides an opportunity to regularise the storage and containment of potential effluent from the baled silage. In terms of conditions, I note the Environment Report includes measures for vermin, odour and dust control in addition to measures to prevent water pollution and I recommend to include these in otherwise standard conditions normally pertaining to such development.
- 9.6.5. **Impact on environment**
- 9.6.6. In this case there is no slurry tank or livestock and while the Environment report acknowledges no soiled yards as a part of the development, the comments on page 3 of that report regarding slurry tanks are accordingly not relevant. The main issue

in terms of pollution is the potential for seepage from the silage effluent which is required to be stored only two stacks high in line with best practice. This I consider can be dealt with by condition and does not constitute grounds for refusal. I say this having particular regard to unfixed nature of the storage and potential to be re-organised to meet with the required regulation. In relation to the soak pit there is concern about the proximity to a private water well. While I note the environment report refers to mains water supply in the area, any breach in standards in terms of proximity of either bale storage or soak pit should be addressed such that there is no potential for seepage into a water supply. This could be addressed by condition whereby the applicant is required to modify the soak pit where necessary in accordance with the requirements of the environment division having regard to proximity to any watercourses or wells. Ultimately, provision should be made for the management of silage so as not to contaminate run-off or interfere in the operation of the soak pit for uncontaminated run-off. A condition to comply with the Department of Agriculture standards would serve to safeguard against pollution and protect public health.

9.6.7. In terms of the deleterious material and debris on site, while clearly littering is not acceptable, part of it may relate to the construction and be temporary in nature. For the avoidance of doubt this could also be addressed by condition in so far as all such materials and any soils or debris relating to completion of landscaping and drainage works shall be disposed of in accordance with a construction and waste management plan and all completed within a specified timeframe for ease of enforcement parameters should the need for such action arise. The bales should be set back from the boundary to allow safe passage around and access to the soakpit and all landscape and boundary treatment should be completed in an orderly and timely manner. These measures are typical of that associated with a new development site and are I consider reasonable.

9.6.8. In terms of vulnerability, I note that the lands are within a white flag area in terms of targeting agricultural measures as mapped on the EPA website. These lands are accordingly in an area not considered as a significant pressure on water quality. It is still important however to ensure precautionary measures are taken to prevent pollution and protect water quality. Accordingly, the measures proposed in the Environment Report are I consider appropriate.

9.7. Traffic Safety

- 9.7.1. There is concern about traffic generated by the heavy machinery along a narrow road that has been maintained by residents. The issue centres more on civil matters in that there is concern about damage to a privately maintained road. As the purpose is to store machinery and hay relating to established farmed lands that are already generating traffic, I do not consider there to be a reasonable basis to refuse permission on grounds of traffic safety. I consider there is merit in the case made in support of the proposal whereby the storage of machinery has the potential to reduce traffic as the storage shed is adjacent to the lands on which the machinery is used and which I note would travel eastwards where there are less houses. A condition restricting or providing for the restriction of the storage of machinery to that only used in lands to the east would help regulate the nature of use and avoid generation of additional unrelated traffic to this tract of land.

9.8. Material contravention

- 9.8.1. As the planning authority has decided to refuse permission on the grounds that the proposed retention of development materially contravenes the development plan, s.37(2) (b) of the 2000 Act states that “the Board may only grant permission in accordance with *paragraph (a)* where it considers that—
- (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 spatial and economic strategy] 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.

9.8.2. In view of the foregoing assessment I am of the opinion that there is an inherent conflict between on the one hand the objectives EC 8-15 in respect of supporting agricultural development and RP 5-19 which seeks to protect the green belt for the purposes of agricultural use and on the other hand, the restriction of development in a scenic areas but which accommodates certain development. I refer to the provision for 'pro-active view of development ' in GI 14-9 which seeks to protect visual amenities but cater for appropriate siting and design in the landscape. I also refer to the word 'minimise' in objective GI 14-10 which refers to development in High Value Landscape and which is not prohibitive. In this case the shed is supported by the former objectives and in this context and having regard to its siting in one of the least exposed areas of this tract of landholding I consider the materiality of contravention on visual grounds is sufficiently outweighed by the aims of EC8-15 particularly in the context of RP 5-19. Similarly in the case of BE15-13 which seeks to limit noise, having regard to the nature and scale of development on existing farmlands the materiality of contravention is I consider sufficiently counterbalanced by EC 8-15. Accordingly, I consider that permission in this instance may be granted having regard to the provisions of (ii) above.

10.0 AA Screening

- 10.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 10.1.2. The subject site is not located in or adjacent to any European site. The nearest site is Roaringbay Waters SAC Site Code: 000101 at a distances of c.270m to the south of the site.
- 10.1.3. The proposal is for retention of a shed for storage of hay and farm machinery on land where silage bales have been stored. It is not proposing water connections although a water main supply is noted by the Environment Department.. Silage bales are regulated by the GAP. As debris on site is to be removed, other sources of contamination are from soiled run-off. However no soiled waters are to be generated or discharged. Only clean water is to discharged to the soakpit. The housing of

machinery also protects from contamination from run-off from machinery stored outside. In terms of the receiving environment the site is not within or directly hydrologically connected to the SAC. Having regard to the nature and scale of development, indirect connection would be imperceptible via the coastal waterbody which is over 300m from the site which would have considerable assimilative capacity relative to any potential pollutant discharges, if any, from the site.

10.1.4. Accordingly, having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale of and nature of development in an established farmyard facility with no evidence of pollution risks.
- Its remoteness and from any European site and lack of meaningful connections to same.
- The considerations of the planning authority in its screening assessment.

10.1.5. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

10.1.6. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

11.0 Recommendation

I recommend that decision of the planning authority be upheld and that permission be granted for the proposed development based on the following reasons and considerations and subject to the conditions hereunder.

Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the established nature of the farming activities in the vicinity of the site and the provisions in objective EC 8-15 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 to support such uses and having regard also to its location in a greenbelt location where it is an objective to preserve lands for agricultural uses as stated in RP 5-19, it is considered that the provision of ancillary facilities would not materially contravene the Development Plan notwithstanding the location of the subject site in the vicinity of residential properties and being within a scenic rural area classed as a High Value Landscape and which includes a protected scenic route and which are protected by GI 14-9 and GI 14-10 in the said Development Plan. Furthermore, it is considered that subject to conditions, by reason of the hillside setting, the retention of the development would not adversely impact the visual amenities or landscape character of the area, would not unduly detract from the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, would not give rise to disturbance or pollution and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and would therefore be acceptable. The proposed retention of development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

Conditions

1	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority, 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 within 3 months of the date of this Order 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>This permission shall be for a period of 7 years from the date of this Order. All structures shall then be removed and the site reinstated to greenfield use unless prior to the end of that period planning permission shall have been granted for their retention for a further period</p> <p>Reason: To enable the planning authority to review the operation of the shed over the stated time period, having regard to the circumstances then prevailing and in the interest of amenity and orderly development.</p>
3	<p>The use of the machinery storage shed shall be limited to agricultural use for the applicant only and lands marked as Block C and the following shall apply:</p> <p>(a) The shed shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the overall landholding.</p> <p>(b) The building shall not be used for human habitation, animal housing or any commercial purpose other than a purpose incidental to farming, whether or not such use might otherwise constitute exempted development.</p> <p>(c) Machinery shall be stored within the confines of the proposed building.</p> <p>(d) Details of the farmlands to which it is ancillary shall be submitted within 3 months of the date of this Order to the planning authority for written agreement.</p> <p>(e) Details of volume, type and method of fuel storage which shall be contained in a waterproof area and its disposal shall be in accordance with the requirements of the planning authority and submitted within 3 months of the date of this Order for written agreement.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity and orderly development, to ensure that the use of the building provides for activities appropriate to the rural area and to prevent pollution.</p>

4	<p>(a) The site shall be operated in accordance with the requirements as outlined in the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations, 2022, as amended</p> <p>(a) A management schedule for the operation of the shed and external silage storage shall be submitted to the planning authority, within 3 months of the date of this Order for written agreement.</p> <p>(b) The management schedule shall comply with the requirements of the European Union (Good Agricultural Practices for the Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022, or as otherwise updated. And shall provide for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The layout and storage of silage bales not stacked greater than 2 rows in height. (ii) Arrangements for the removal of organic waste and its use by the applicant (iii) Arrangement for the cleansing of the shed and yard and road serving the development, where relevant. (iv) measures for vermin control (v) measures to minimise odour and dust outside the site. <p>Reason: In order to prevent pollution and in the interest of amenity</p>
5	<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-</p> <p>(a) Details of all silage storage which shall comply with the Statutory Management Regulations as issued by the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, shall be submitted for written agreement within 3 months of the date of this order.</p> <p>(b) Drainage details including details of soak pit design shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority, prior to commencement of development.</p>

	<p>(c) All separation distances for potable water supplies as outlined in the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the Protection of Waters) (Amendment) Regulations 2022, as amended shall be strictly adhered to.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and public health.</p>
6	<p>The existing front boundary hedge shall be reinstated and augmented along the eastern site frontage except to the extent that it is necessary to provide for the entrance to the site but not exceeding 4.5m. Details shall be submitted within 3 months of the date of this Order and works shall be completed within 12 months of the date of this order</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and biodiversity.</p>
7	<p>(a) The landscaping scheme shown on Site Layout (Landscaping Plan), as submitted to An Bord Pleanála on the 17th day of December 2025 shall be carried out within the first planting season of the date of the Order.</p> <p>(b) The site shall be maintained in an orderly manner and there shall be no external storage of machinery or related goods, materials or any waste products .</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and biodiversity</p>
8	<p>In the event of an accidental spillage of wastewater, organic fertiliser, fuel, machine oil or any other substance which may threaten the quality of any watercourse or groundwater body either at construction or operational phase, the Planning Authority and Inland Fisheries Ireland, shall be notified as soon as is practicable. A copy of the clean-up plan shall be submitted to the Planning Authority.</p>

	Reason: In the interest of public health.
9	<p>In relation to debris on site, within 3 months of the date of this Order, a Resource Waste Management Plan (RWMP), as set out in the Environmental Protection Agency's Best Practice Guidelines for the Preparation of Resource and Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects (2021), shall be prepared and submitted to the planning authority for written agreement. The RWMP shall include specific proposals as to how the RWMP will be measured and monitored for effectiveness. All records (including for waste and all resources) pursuant to the agreed RWMP shall be made available for inspection at all times.</p> <p>Reason: in the interest of sustainable waste management.</p>
10	<p>A plan containing details for the management of waste (and, in particular, recyclable materials) within the development, including the provision of facilities for the storage, separation and collection of the waste and, in particular, recyclable materials shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. Thereafter, the agreed waste facilities shall be maintained and waste shall be managed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>Reason: To provide for the appropriate management of waste and, in particular recyclable materials, in the interest of protecting the environment and the amenities of properties i"</p>
11	<p>During the operational phase of the proposed development the noise level shall not exceed (a) 55 dB(A) rated sound level between the hours of 0700 to 2300, and (b) 45 dB(A) 15min and 60 dB LAfmax, 15min at all other times , (corrected for a tonal or impulsive component) as measured at the nearest</p>

	<p>dwelling. Procedures for the purpose of determining compliance with this limit shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority within 3 months of the date of this Order.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the residential amenities of property in the vicinity of the site</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

Suzanne Kehely

Senior Planning Inspector

4th July 2025

Appendix 1 - Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening [EIAR not submitted]

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP- 320708		
Proposed Development Summary	Retention of agricultural shed for storage of machinery and hay.		
Development Address	Colla, Schull, 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	Proceed to Q2	
	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 Screening required
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class? N/A			
Yes			
No			Proceed to Q4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]? N/A			
Yes			
5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?			
No	x	Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)	
Yes			

Inspector: _____

Date: 4th July 2025

Appendix 3

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
Brief description of project	Retention of agricultural shed for storage of machinery and hay.
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	<p>The site is .12 of a hectare in a rural area and relates to part of a dispersed 25 hectare landholding which is formed by two tracts of land separated by approx. 900m. The site comprises a yard and shed (the subject of retention) alongside a field that is fenced off and accessed via a gate from the road. It is approx. 270 m from the nearest European site along the coast to the south and from which it is separated by two roads, dwellings and open ground.</p> <p>The yard is used for the storage of silage and shed has been constructed based on standard construction materials and finishes for such development. All run off to discharge to a soakpit and silage bales are required to be stored in line with GAP/SMR. The containment of machinery rather than external storage protects from contamination of run-off. The proposed retention of development would be unlikely to give rise to significant source impacts, given nature and scale of the development and considering the weak and indirect ecological connections such as via the site drainage/soak pit percolating to the groundwater into the river basin and coastal waters and having regard to the distance to the nearest European Site.</p>
Screening report	No
Natura Impact Statement	No

Relevant submissions	<u>Applicant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Planning application form describes scale of farm. <u>Observing party on application:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concern about seepage to groundwater and impact on well in neighboring property <u>Planning Authority primary report and Environment report:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Screened out need for AA noting the absence of adverse impacts or obvious pathways. No new risk anticipated to river catchment (se WFD screening assessment)			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance(km) from proposed development	Ecological connections ¹	Consider further in screening ² Y/N

Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC Site Code 000101	Large shallow inlets and bays [1160] Reefs [1170] Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230] European dry heaths [4030] Submerged or partially submerged sea caves [8330] Phocoena phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351] Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] Halichoerus grypus (Grey Seal) [1364] Site specific cons o bi	270m	None There are no watercourses on site providing a hydrological pathway to these water quality dependent habitats and species. The coastal waters are in the order of 260m from the site	N
Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC (Site Code: 001040)	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] Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritima) [1330]	Approx. 7.5km	None There are no watercourses on site providing a hydrological pathway to these water quality dependent habitats and species.	N

	Mediterranean salt meadows (<i>Juncetalia maritimi</i>) [1410] Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120] Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130] European dry heaths [4030] <i>Petalophyllum ralfsii</i> (Petalwort) [1395] Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service		The coastal waters are in the order of 260m from the coastal waters and from where the site is an additional 7km away.	
--	--	--	--	--

¹ Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

²if no connections: N

Step 3. Likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

N/A

While works could generate dust and deposition on surface water there are no nearby watercourses. I do not consider there to be any meaningful direct ecological connection or pathways to the coastal waters which are c.270m away and separated by roads and residential properties which combine to provide a significant buffer to any ecological receptor within the designated sites. I therefore consider it highly unlikely that the development would generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect this SAC or other European sites.

No soiled yards form part of the development and silage bales are required to be managed to ensure this under the Statutory Management Regulations. The soak pit in the present arrangement is without evidence of an issue. I refer to the PA Environment Report . The proposed development is not likely to generate impacts that could affect anything other than the immediate area of the development. Having regard and the hydrological distance and to the level of dilution in the coastal waters, no impacts are likely.

Likely effect in view of conservation objectives

The construction or operation of the development is not likely to have resulted in or result in impacts that could affect the conservation objectives of the nearest SAC down gradient of the site. Due to the absence of any direct hydrological connection, there is no potential for any surface water run-off laden with silt or pollutants to enter the SAC waters. Furthermore, due to the distance and lack of meaningful ecological connections it is most unlikely that there could be changes in the ecological functioning in the vicinity of relevant receptor arising from any construction related emissions or disturbance.

Having regard the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage's National Planning Application database and EIA Portal and Cork County Council's planning register and also noting the White Flag status of surrounding agricultural lands on the EPA database, I consider that the proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to a cumulative effect with other developments in the area. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Step 4 Conclusion

I conclude that the proposed development alone would not result in likely significant effects on Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC (Site Code 000101) or Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC (Site Code - 001040) The proposed 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.

Appendix 4**WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING****Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality**

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ABP- 321470	Townland, address	Colla, Schull, Co. Cork
Description of project		Retention of agricultural shed for storage of machinery and hay and associated site development works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening		<p>The development site is part of an agricultural beef livestock suckler farm located in hillside setting of grazing lands and intermittent housing all set in a rural coastal area. The nearest waterbody is the coastal waters of Roaringwater Bay c.270m from the site. There is no watercourse within or in the immediate vicinity of the site.</p> <p>The nearest river as mapped on the EPA maps is over 2.5km away and forms part of Lowertown_10 river catchment as part of the larger Bandon-Ilen catchment which discharges to the Roaringwater Bay. The hydrological connection is possible through on site drainage and soakpit.</p> <p>In terms of agricultural land and impact on water quality I note a White Flag status which indicates no present risk to water quality posed by the agricultural lands in the area.</p>	

	<p>The proposed development comprises retention of a dry store for machinery and hay and does not provide for livestock or associated effluent. Silage bale storage is an ongoing activity for 18 years and is shown to be retained but this is subject to correct stacking in line with Good Agricultural Practice and does not in such circumstances pose a risk.</p> <p>. While there is potentially deleterious material on site associated with construction works these are assumed to be removed as part of an appropriate waste and site works management.</p>
Proposed surface water details	Clean run-off to on-site Soakpit.
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	None proposed
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	None. Silage storage and control of effluent to required to be managed in compliance with S.I. No. 113/2022 - European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022 (GAP Regs) which give effect to the Nitrates Action Programme concerning the protection of water against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources.
Others Matters	. Water quality concerns are raised in general terms by one neighbouring resident in terms of proximity to well and deleterious material seeping to the ground water.

Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature
No mapped river waterbody on or close to site –	Approx. 2.3km (as mapped on EPA website)	Subcatchment 20-3 EnterpriseCentre Skull SC-010 Part of the Bandon-Ilen catchment (20) District Code IESW. In the Lowertown_010 River Sub-Basin EU CD IE_SW_20L560540	Good	Not at risk	No pressures in this catchment	None due to terrain and distance from watercourse.

Groundwater	Underlying site	Skibbereen-Clonakilty code IE-SW-G-085	good	Not at risk		On-site soakpit drainage.
Coastal waterbody (Roaringwater Bay)	300m to south	Part of Bandon-Ilen catchment, (20) Code IE_SW_140_0000	Ecological status or potential is 'good' Chemical s.w. status is 'failing to achieve good' due to unspec. isomers and tributyltin.	Not at risk	Failure of wastewater treatment plant but this is significantly eastwards along the coast (c 20km)	none.
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.						
CONSTRUCTION PHASE						

No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Dust dispersion during earthworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (river) Bandon-Ilen catchment (20) District Code IESW. Sub-catchment Toormore-10 • (groundwater) Skibbereen-Clonakilty IE-SW-G-085 	Potential for hydrological pathway / indirect impact via surface water drainage /on site soakpit	Surface water pollution minimal, if any	None other than standard construction and GAP practices.	No	Screened out

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Coastal) Part of Bandon-Ilen catchment, (20) <p>IE_SW_140_000</p> <p>0</p>					
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Soiled water contaminating run-off discharge to soakpit	As above	Potential for hydrological pathway and indirect impact via surface water drains/on site soakpit	Drainage and waste management is designed to collect contaminated run-off/silage effluent. The slurry is to be designed and	None other than standard best practice for silage bale storage to ensure no contaminated waters enter surface water drainage.	No	<p>Screened out</p> <p>[See determination within Section 6 of report].</p>

				managed to be compliant with GAP Regs. Other safeguards for fuel storage and management will protect from localised impacts.			
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A