# Inspector's Report
# ABP-321519-24

| | |
|---|---|
| **Development** | Construction of dwelling house, installation of waste water treatment system, and for all associated site works |
| **Location** | Dromsullivan South, Bantry, Co. Cork |
| **Planning Authority** | West Cork County Council |
| **Planning Authority Reg. Ref.** | 24500 |
| **Applicant(s)** | Shauna O'Sullivan |
| **Type of Application** | Permission |
| **Planning Authority Decision** | Grant with conditions |
| **Type of Appeal** | Third Party |
| **Appellant(s)** | Eugene O'Sullivan |
| **Observer(s)** | none |
| **Date of Site Inspection** | 12th June 2025 |
| **Inspector** | Aisling MacNamara |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The proposed development relates to a 0.54ha site located within the rural area of Dromsullivan South, Bantry in County Cork. The site is accessed by the L8771 local secondary road and is located c 7km northeast of Bantry. The site is bounded to the east by the L8771 road and to all other boundaries by agricultural lands. There are two existing residential properties located on the eastern side of the L8771 road. There is a stream running along the northwestern boundary of the site. The site is accessed from an existing agricultural gate. There is also a laneway access near the northern boundary of the site which serves the adjoining agricultural lands. The site is in a natural condition and contains rocky outcrops, grass, shrubs and trees. There is an embankment along the northwestern boundary of the site. There are natural hedges along the roadside boundary and along the southern side of the laneway and stream. There is evidence of stone material deposited on parts of the site.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for the following:

- construction of 180m² 4 bed dwelling (part single, part two storey),
- installation of waste water treatment system
- associated site works

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

By order dated 29th November 2024, the planning authority granted permission subject to 20 conditions.

Condition 2 relates to section 47 agreement.

Conditions 3, 4 and 5 relate to the finishes of the roof, walls, windows and doors.

Conditions 6 and 7 relate to landscaping and roadside boundary planting.

Condition 13 requires sight distance of 90m in both directions from point 2.4m back and vegetation not exceeding 1m within the sight triangle.

Conditions 14, 15 and 16 relate to surface water drainage to prevent flooding of public road.

Condition 18 requires foul drainage in accordance with EPA Code of Practice, Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (p.e. less than or equal to 10) 2021.

Condition 19 relates to maintenance of the treatment system.

## 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

- The report of the Case Planner (30/10/2024) recommends Further Information.
- Unsolicited further information was submitted by the applicant on 22/10/2024. The applicant submitted a map showing the location of the proposed well and existing wells to the east of the site.
- Further Information was requested on 30/10/2024 in relation to three items: (1) submit revised site plan showing 90m northern sightline from 2.4m back and no vegetation over 1m within the sight triangle; (2) concerns regarding the percolation values of in situ soil, noting material dumped on site and rocky outcrops, requested to open new trial hole near the proposed percolation area to confirm the soil profile and water table depth; (3) submit confirmation regarding the location of third party wells in the area and compliance with good practice and guidelines.
- Response to FI request submitted on 13/11/2024 as follows:

  (1) Revised site layout showing termination points of all sightlines at 2.4m set back from edge of the road,

  (2) Revised site layout showing original location of trial hole dug June 2024 and two additional trial holes T1 and T2 dug 4th November 2024 and inspected 6th November 2024. The initial trial hole had no water in same however TI and T2 had 270mm and 100mm water respectively. Revised

Site Characterisation Form Part 3.2 (trial hole) is submitted and photographs. The amended form uses the higher water table in T1 of 270mm for the amended form. The proposed new invert level of the filter bed is to be 1200mm over the water table level.

(3) Site layout plan showing the location of all relevant existing and proposed wells.

- The second report of the Case Planner (27/11/2024) considered the FI response, was satisfied with the response and recommended grant of permission.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer report of 17/10/2024 recommends deferral to clarify matters relating to the termination of the northern 90m sightline and concerns regarding the percolation value of soil noting fill material on site and requests new trial hole to confirm soil profile and water table depth. The site is not likely to be affected by flooding, the site is in Flood Zone C. Sight visibility is obstructed by vegetation on both sides.
- Area Engineer report of 19/11/2024 considered the FI response, has no objection and recommends grant of permission with conditions. Sight lines are shown of 90m in both directions. The proposed WWTS is satisfactory. The required separation distances to neighbouring wells comply with EPA CoP Table 6.2 (the neighbouring wells are 118m and 144m from the proposed waste water treatment system).

## 3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

None received.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

An observation was received from a resident of the area raising issues relating to the location of bored wells in the area, unlicensed and illegal soil recovery deposit area is located adjacent to the proposed development – runoff from the proposed development will be directed towards this soil recovery area, impact on biodiversity and wildlife.

## 4.0 Planning History

None on site.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

The Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 applies. The following is of relevance:

- The site is located within the rural housing policy area 'Tourism and Rural Diversification Area'.
- The site is located within a High Value Landscape.

The following objectives are of relevance:

Chapter 5 Rural

- *RP 5-5: Tourism and Rural Diversification Area*

*This rural area has experienced high housing construction rates and above average housing vacancy rates which has led to concerns that a higher demand for holiday and second homes is depriving genuine rural communities the opportunity to meet their own rural generated housing needs. Therefore, in order to make provision for the genuine rural generated housing needs of persons from the local community based on their social and / or economic links to a particular local rural area and to recognise the significant opportunities for tourism and rural diversification that exist in this rural area, it is an objective that applicants must demonstrate that their proposal complies with one of the following categories of housing need: (a) to (g)….*

- *RP 5-23: Servicing Single Houses (and ancillary development) in Rural Areas*

*a) Ensure that proposals for development incorporating on-site wastewater disposal systems comply with the EPA Code of Practice Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) and Wastewater Treatment Manual - Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business Centres, Leisure Centres and Hotels (1999), or relevant successor approved standards / guidelines (including design, installation and maintenance). The cumulative impact of such systems will also be considered in the assessment process.*

*b) Surface water should be disposed of using sustainable drainage systems and in a manner that will not endanger the receiving environment or public health. The use of permeable paving should also be considered to reduce run off.*

Chapter 11 Water Management

- *WM 11-1: EU Water Framework Directive and the River Basin Management Plan*

*a) Protect and improve the County's water resources and ensure that development permitted meets the requirements of the River Basin Management Plan and does not contravene the objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive*

- *WM 11-8: Water Supply*

*a)Support the prioritisation of the supply of adequate sustainable drinking water for the resident population and invest and expand the water supply in line with future population targets. b) Ensure that all drinking water in the County complies with the European Union Drinking Water Directive 98/83/EC and that all surface water and groundwater supplies comply with the requirements of Surface Water Directive 75/440/EC and Groundwater Directive 80/68/EEC. c) Conserve sources of drinking water and minimise threats to either the quality or quantity of drinking water reserves that might result from different forms of development or development activity and other sources of pollution.*

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is not within or immediately adjacent to any areas designated for natural heritage.

## 6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal is received. The issues raised are summarised as follows:

- No flood risk assessment was carried out. A stream flows adjacent to the boundary. During Hurricane Charlie the stream flooded some of the site and public road. A new entrance is to be constructed. Due to the entrance design and angle, stream water will overflow into the site.
- Concern that overflow flood water from stream will contaminate the proposed well drinking water supply.
- A flood risk assessment should be undertaken or permission should be refused.

### 7.2. Applicant Response

None received.

### 7.3. Planning Authority Response

The planning authority responded to the grounds of appeal. The response is from the Area Engineer and the issues raised are summarised as follows:

- The site is located in Flood Zone C (low probability of flooding from fluvial or tidal sources) under the Cork County Council CFRAM maps.

- The stream referred to by the appellant does not show up as flood risk. The nearest CFRAM risk area is 200m downstream from the site to the southeast.
- Roadside property owners are required to accept surface water for the public road where possible / necessary. It is the property owner's responsibility to dispose of such surface water (by soakaway or to a watercourse) in a responsible manner.
- The proposed FFL of the house is below the level of the public road at the proposed entrance.
- There is an embankment between the dwelling and stream which provides protection to the dwelling from the stream.
- Hurricane Charlie was an extreme weather event.
- If guidance of Institutes of Geology Ireland is followed, there should be no surface water infiltration of the well via the well head.
- In conclusion, according to the available information, the development is not at risk of flooding.

7.4. **Observations**

None received.

## 8.0 Assessment

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all 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 the appeal are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Flooding
- Existing and proposed well supplies
- Waste water treatment and disposal
- Surface water disposal

The Commission should note that in undertaking this assessment, a report was received form the Inspectorate Environmental Scientist dated 22nd August 2025 and the findings of the report have informed the following assessment.

8.2. **Principle of development**

8.2.1. The proposed development is for the construction of a single rural house and associated works. Under the Cork County Development Plan (CDP) 2022-2028, the site is located within the rural area designated Tourism and Rural Diversification Area. Objective RP5-5 states that applicants in this area must demonstrate a rural generated housing need based on their social and / or economic links to the area and criteria (a) to (g) set out in the CDP.

8.2.2. The planning authority was satisfied that the applicant has a local connection to the area and a housing need and qualifies for a rural house in accordance with the criteria of RP5-5.

8.2.3. I am satisfied that the proposal for a single rural house is acceptable in principle, subject to other planning considerations.

8.3. **Flooding**

8.3.1. There is a stream located along the northern side of the site. The appeal submission raises concerns that part to the site and road have previously flooded from the stream (citing Hurricane Charlie), and that this flooding poses a risk to the proposed well on the site and that a flood risk assessment should be carried out.

8.3.2. On day of site visit I observed a small area of flooding (assumed from stream) on the northern laneway near the stream. There is an embankment running along the northwestern boundary of the site which separates the main part of the site to be developed, from the stream and laneway. On day of site visit, I observed no flooding on the main site and no flooding at the location of the proposed house, well or wastewater treatment system.

8.3.3. The Area Engineer considered flood risk as part of the report on the application. The report indicates that the site is in Flood Zone C and that it is unlikely that the site would be affected by flooding.

8.3.4. The OPW Flood Map website shows that the site is not within any flood zone on the CFRAM flood extent maps and the national indicative flood maps. In addition, there

is no record on the site of a past flood event on the OPW layer Past Flood Events. In this regard, I also note that no documentary evidence is submitted by the appellant regarding past flooding on the site.

8.3.5. I am satisfied that based on the information available including OPW flood maps, the report of the Area Engineer, the site features including embankment along the northwestern part of the site separating the development from the stream, that the development is not at significant flood risk associated with the river and site specific flood risk assessment is not warranted.

8.3.6. Regarding the risk posed specifically to the well by any form of contamination from ground including surface water, I am satisfied that that the well head can be protected by standard best practice installation measures.

8.4. **Waste water treatment and disposal (potential new issue)**

8.4.1. It is proposed to dispose effluent from the proposed house via an on site domestic waste water treatment system. Whilst not raised as an issue in the appeal submission, I have considered the adequacy of the proposed on site effluent disposal measures.

8.4.2. Objective RP5-23 of the CDP provides that proposals for on site wastewater disposal systems comply with the EPA Code of Practice Domestic (EPA CoP) Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10).

8.4.3. A site suitability assessment (SSA) report is submitted. The Geological Survey Ireland maps show that the site is in a resource protection area with a 'locally important aquifer – bedrock which is moderately productive only in local zones' and is within an area where groundwater is extremely vulnerable with 'rock at or near surface/ karst'. The EPA CoP Table E1 indicates that the site falls within the R2(1) category which indicates that the site is suitable for domestic waste water and treatment system subject to normal good practice and that where domestic water supplies are located nearby, particular attention should be given to the depth of subsoil over bedrock such that the minimum depths are met and microbial pollution is minimised.

8.4.4. The SSA shows trial hole was dug to 1.5m to bedrock. The log shows topsoil to 400mm, silt/clay to 950mm and no water by 1.5m. A surface percolation test was

carried out and a percolation value of 22.58 was recorded. The site was deemed suitable for the installation of an on site system. Table 6.3 of the EPA CoP requires 0.9m of unsaturated soil and/ or subsoil for polishing filters following secondary systems. According to the trial hole log, this site has 0.95m of subsoil which makes it compliant with the depth requirement. It is proposed to install a 6 person pumped treatment plant and soil polishing filter.

8.4.5. At application stage, the planning authority noted that there was soil material deposited on the site and further information was requested including the digging of new trial holes to show that the ground is suitable for on site disposal. The applicant excavated two further trial holes and submitted the findings in the further information response of 13th November 2024. The results of the new trial hole assessments showed water table was encountered at 1.15m. The photographs of the new trial holes show significant depths of fractured bedrock (grey material) present in both excavations which is in keeping with the GSI mapping for the site. Based on the photographic evidence presented of the trial holes, I am not satisfied that the photographs show that there is adequate (0.9m) depth of soil above the water table or bedrock.

8.4.6. Whilst material appears to have been deposited on parts of the site, there is no evidence (in the trial hole logs and photographs) that made ground (imported material) was encountered in any of the three trial holes. On this basis, the percolation tests show the ability of naturally occurring soil, subsoil and bedrock to attenuate wastewater. The presence or otherwise of imported material on any other part of the site would have no significant impact on the suitability of the site to safely attenuate the proposed wastewater.

8.4.7. The minimum separation distances outlined in Table 6.2 of the CoP can be achieved for all identified features which relate to the site. Existing neighbouring wells to the east are 118m and 114m upgradient of the WWTS. The required 15m minimum separation distance is achieved.

8.4.8. Table 6.2 identifies that soakaway for surface water drainage should be located down gradient of the infiltration treatment area. In this case, it is proposed to install the soakaway upgradient of the infiltration treatment area. Should permission be

granted, a condition should be attached requiring the relocation of the soakaway downgradient of the infiltration treatment area.

8.4.9. The applicant proposed to install a P6 pumped secondary treatment plant followed by a 3m² sand polishing filter sitting on top of a 45m² stone bed. The proposed development of 6p.e. x loading of 150l/person /day will generate a total loading of 900l/day. Section 10.2.1 of the EPA CoP requires that the hydraulic loading of sand polishing filters used for tertiary treatment of wastewater from secondary treatment should not exceed 60l/m²/day. Therefore the required surface area for the sand polishing filter is 900/60 = 15m² which must be min 900mm deep. The final effluent from this sand polishing filter should be discharged in accordance with Table 10.1 (option 6) of 7.5m² x 6 p.e. = 45m² gravel infiltration bed. The applicant has proposed that a 3m² sand filter be installed. This is not in accordance with the CoP 2021 requirements. The design could lead to overloading and potential failure of the sand polishing filter. The proposed on site wastewater treatment system is not acceptable.

8.4.10. In conclusion, having regard to the failure to show that minimum depths of unsaturated soil /subsoil can be provided as per EPA CoP 2021 standards and the failure to propose a design that is in accordance with EPA CoP 2021 standards, it is considered that the proposed waste water treatment system is not acceptable and would result in risk to public health. Refusal is recommended.

8.5. **Existing and proposed well supplies (potential new issue)**

8.5.1. Concerns were raised at application stage by the third party regarding the proposals to bore a new well to serve the proposed house and the impact on existing well supplies in the area. Whilst not raised in the appeal submission, I have considered this issue.

8.5.2. The proposed site is located in an area overlaying a locally important bedrock aquifer which is moderately productive only in local zones. Locally important aquifers are capable of supplying locally important abstractions (e.g. smaller public water supplies, group schemes), or good yields (100-400m3/d). Given the current low density of wells in the vicinity of the proposed development, I do not believe that the groundwater resource at this location will be impacted quantitatively by the installation of the proposed well which will serve one dwelling.

8.5.3. The Institute of Geologists of Ireland guidance document 'Water Well Construction' sets out recommended distance of a private well from a pollution source. Depending on the type of subsoil, minimum distances range from 30m to 60m. The proposed well is to be 55m and 70m from the existing septic tanks and percolation areas to the east. I am satisfied that the proposed well is located a satisfactory distance from nearby waste water treatment systems and that the proposed well would not be at risk from this source of contamination.

In conclusion, I am satisfied that the proposed well water supply would not pose a significant threat to existing drinking water supplies and that the proposed house can be served by an acceptable drinking water supply.

8.6. **Surface water disposal (new issue)**

8.6.1. It is proposed to discharge surface water on site to ground via soakaways in accordance with BRE Digest 365.

8.6.2. The site is located on lands with 'rock at or near the surface'. As per site visit, rock outcrops are visible on the site. The photographs of the trial holes show fractured bedrock. A water table was encountered at 1.18m below ground.

8.6.3. No information is submitted regarding percolation tests or design details for the proposed soakaways.

8.6.4. No information is submitted to show that the site can accommodate the proposed on site disposal of surface water. In the absence of this being demonstrated, there is a risk that surface water will not be collected and managed in a sustainable manner, with risk to the environment by reason of potential flooding.

## 9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).

9.2. The closest Natura 2000 site is Derryclogher (Knockboy) Bog SAC c 7.8km from the site.

9.3. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no

conceivable risk to any Natura 2000 site. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

- the small domestic nature and scale of the proposed development,
- the distance between the site and any Natura 2000 site,
- the lack of ecological or hydrological pathways between the site and the Natura 2000 site network.

9.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any Natura 2000 site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended) is not required.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). A screening assessment for WFD is attached to this report.

10.2. The site is located within the Dunmanus-Bantry-Kenmare WFD catchment and the Mealagh_SC_010 sub catchment. The MEALAGH_020 river crosses through the site. The site overlays the Beara Sneem groundwater body. The Mealagh_020 has a ‘high’ WFD status and is ‘not at risk’. The Beara Sneem has ‘good’ status and is ‘not at risk’.

10.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seeks to protect and where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.

10.4. Having regard to the nature, scale and location of the proposed development and the failure to adequately design the proposed on site wastewater treatment system in accordance with EPA CoP requirements, I consider that the proposed development will result in a risk of deterioration of the ground water body Beara Sneem on a

permanent basis and would jeopardise the WFD objective to prevent the deterioration of the status of groundwater and to protect groundwater.

10.5. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, I consider that, subject to condition requiring the submission of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan prior to construction, that the proposed development will not result in the deterioration of surface water body Mealagh_020 either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise these waterbodies in reaching WFD objectives.

## 11.0 Recommendation

It is recommended that permission be refused.

## 12.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Objective RP5-23 (a) of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 is to ensure that proposals for development incorporating on-site wastewater disposal systems comply with the Environmental Protection Agency Code of Practice Domestic (EPA CoP) Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.

   Having regard to the following:

   - the proposal to treat and dispose of effluent from the proposed house via on site waste water treatment system,

   - the photographic evidence of the trial holes excavated on site which show fractured bedrock and the failure to show with certainty that the required minimum depth of unsaturated soil and / or subsoil is provided,

   - the design of the proposed infiltration area which contains an undersized sand polishing filter,

   the Commission is not satisfied that effluent from the development can be treated and disposed of on site in accordance with the EPA CoP 2021.

Therefore it is considered that the proposed waste water treatment system would be prejudicial to public health and contrary to objective RP5-23 of the development plan.

Furthermore, the inability to effectively treat and dispose of effluent would be detrimental to the quality of the Bear Sneem groundwater body which has a 'good' Water Framework Directive status and this would be contrary to Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which requires the prevention of the deterioration of the status of groundwater bodies and the protection of groundwater bodies.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Insufficient information is available to demonstrate that surface water can be collected and disposed of on site in an acceptable manner. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development is a serious danger to the environment and would be 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.

Aisling Mac Namara
Planning Inspector

20th October 2025

## Appendix 1: Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

| | |
|---|---|
| **Case Reference** | 321519 |
| **Proposed Development Summary** | Construction of dwelling house, installation of waste water treatment system, and for all associated site works |
| **Development Address** | Dromsullivan South, Bantry, Co. Cork |
| | **In all cases check box /or leave blank** |
| **1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?**<br><br>(For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means:<br>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,<br><br>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources) | ☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.<br><br>☐ No, No further action required. |
| **2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?** | |
| ☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><br>**EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested.** | State the Class here |
| ☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3 | |
| **3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?** | |
| ☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.<br><br>**No Screening required.** | |
| ☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br><br>**EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.<br><br>**Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)**<br><br>**OR**<br><br>**If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)** | Schedule 5, Part 2, 10 (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units |

| **4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?** | |
|---|---|
| **Yes ☐** | **Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)** |
| **No ☒** | **Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)** |

**Inspector:** _____ Date: _____

## Appendix 2: Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

| | |
|---|---|
| **Case Reference** | 321519 |
| **Proposed Development Summary** | Construction of dwelling house, installation of waste water treatment system, and for all associated site works |
| **Development Address** | Dromsullivan South, Bantry, Co. Cork |
| **This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.** | |
| **Characteristics of proposed development**<br><br>(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). | - Proposed residential use is compatible with other uses in area,<br>- Modest size and intensity of development<br>- Localised impact on natural resources<br>- Modest production of waste<br>- No significant risk of pollution or nuisance<br>- No significant risk of accidents / disasters to human health |
| **Location of development**<br><br>(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). | - Rural area<br>- Local ecology only on site<br>- No built heritage on site<br>- stream traverses the site<br>- No designated sites at the site<br>- Localised impacts on landscape |
| **Types and characteristics of potential impacts**<br><br>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation). | Having regard to the following:<br>- nature and scale of the development,<br>- lack of significant environmental sensitivities on the site,<br>- absence of significant in combination effects,<br><br>there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act. |

| **Conclusion** | |
|---|---|
| **Likelihood of Significant Effects** | **Conclusion in respect of EIA** |
| There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.<br><br>x | EIA is not required. |

**Inspector:** _____Date: _____

**DP/ADP:** _____Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

## Appendix 3: Water Framework Directive Screening

| WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality** | | | |
| **An Bord Pleanála ref. no.** | 321519 | **Townland, address** | Dromsullivan South, Bantry, Co.Cork |
| **Description of project** | | Construction of dwelling, waste water treatment system and site works | |
| **Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,** | | Site within rural area on undeveloped land.<br>Stream traverses site. | |
| **Proposed surface water details** | | On site soakaways to BRE 365 | |
| **Proposed water supply source & available capacity** | | Private well | |
| **Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues** | | On site treatment system | |

**Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection**

| Identified water body | Water body name(s) (code) | Distance to (m) | 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 (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| River | MEALAGH_020<br>(protected area Article 7 Abstraction for Drinking Water | on site | High<br>2019-2024 | Not at risk | | stream on site |
| Groundwater | Beara Sneem<br>(protected area Article 7 Abstraction for Drinking Water) | undergrou nd | Good 2019-2024 | Not at risk | | underground |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

| **Step 3: 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 | Waterbody receptor (EPA Code) | Pathway (existing and new) | Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact | Screening Stage Mitigation Measure* | Residual Risk (yes/no)<br><br>Detail | **Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.** |
| | surface | MEALAGH_020 | Construction runoff | Pollution and sedimentation | Construction best practice CEMP (requires condition) | no | Screened out |
| | ground | Beara Sneem | Construction runoff | Pollution | Construction best practice CEMP (requires condition) | no | Screened out |
| **OPERATIONAL PHASE** | | | | | | | |
| | ground | Beara Sneem | Storm water drainage | none - storm water is clean uncontaminated | soakaway | no | Screened out |
| | ground | Beara Sneem | On site effluent disposal | Pollution | EPA CoP | yes | There is a risk |
| **DECOMMISSIONING PHASE** | | | | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | | | |

| STAGE 2: ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template** | | | | | |
| **Surface Water** | | | | | |
| **Development/Activity** e.g. culvert, bridge, other crossing, diversion, outfall, etc | **Objective 1:Surface Water** **Prevent deterioration of the status of all bodies of surface water** | **Objective 2:Surface Water** **Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of surface water with aim of achieving good status** | **Objective 3:Surface Water** **Protect and enhance all artificial and heavily modified bodies of water with aim of achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status** | **Objective 4: Surface Water** **Progressively reduce pollution from priority substances and cease or phase out emission, discharges and losses of priority substances** | **Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a derogation under art. 4.7)** |
| | **Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1:** | **Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2:** | **Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3:** | **Describe mitigation required to meet objective 4:** | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| **Details of Mitigation Required to Comply with WFD Objectives – Template** | | | | | |
| **Groundwater** | | | | | |
| **Development/Activity** e.g. abstraction, outfall, etc. | **Objective 1: Groundwater** **Prevent or limit the input of pollutants into groundwater and to prevent the deterioration of the status of all bodies of groundwater** | **Objective 2 : Groundwater** **Protect, enhance and restore all bodies of groundwater, ensure a balance between abstraction and recharge,** | **Objective 3:Groundwater** **Reverse any significant and sustained upward trend in the concentration of any pollutant resulting from the impact of human activity** | | **Does this component comply with WFD Objectives 1, 2, 3 & 4? (if answer is no, a development cannot proceed without a** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **with the aim of achieving good status*** | | **derogation under art. 4.7)** |
| | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 1: | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 2: | Describe mitigation required to meet objective 3: | |
| Effluent disposal to ground | Does not comply with EPA CoP | Does not comply with EPA CoP | n/a | No |
| | | | | |

## Appendix 4: Technical Note of Environmental Scientist dated 22nd August 2025