



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321603-25

Development	Demolition of house and construction of house and garage, together with all associated site works.
Location	Cahanagh, Newtownforbes, Longford.
Planning Authority	Longford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460060
Applicant(s)	Seamus Hannify
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Noel & Marian Cafferty
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	23/03/25
Inspector	Darragh Ryan

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The proposed development is located in the townland of Cahanagh and sits at a junction of local road L1005 and regional road R198. The site is 770m west of Melview village, 2.6km east of Newtownforbes and 3.3km north of Longford town. The site contains a number of vacant and derelict stone structures which appear to be agricultural farm sheds on site.
- 1.2. To the south of the site is a row of 5 houses on their own half acre/acre sites and to the east of the site is a number of single dwellings. The subject site has a defined area of 0.26 hectare and is identified to be in the ownership of the applicants.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The Applicant proposes to construct a 4 bedroom, single storey bungalow style dwelling with a stated total floor area of 189.42sq.m. The dwelling includes a nap plaster finish with natural stone sections included to the front and rear section of the structure. The dwelling has a maximum ridge height of 5.532m and 2.59m to the eaves.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

- 3.1. **The planning authority issued a Decision to grant permission subject to 15 conditions:**

C3 – The proposed development when completed shall be first occupied as a place of permanent residence by the applicant , members of the applicants immediate family or their heirs and shall remain so occupied of a period of 7 years.

C5 - Prior to commencement of development the applicant shall apply for a derogation licence from the NPWS in respect of potential Bat roosting within the buildings.

C15 – A financial contribution of 2,050.00 euros is payable to Longford County Council in accordance with adopted Development Contribution Scheme

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. There are two planning authority reports on file. A further information request was sought for the following:

- The applicant is required to demonstrate rural housing need to indicate compliance with Section 4.8.12 of the Longford County Development Plan.
- The applicant is required to demonstrate setback distance from the regional road and local road for the dwelling as required under Section 16.4.8 of the Longford County Development Plan
- Sightline details towards the regional are required to demonstrate unobstructed sight distances in line with policy DMS 16.115 of the Longford County Development Plan
- No details of the structures for demolition have been provided the applicant requested to provide detail of same.
- The proposal will result in the creation of ribbon development, the applicant requested to make a justification for the proposed development.

Upon receipt of further information, the planning authority considered the following:

- The planning authority considered the applicant qualified to construct a dwelling in this local rural area as they have met the housing need criteria in compliance with Section 4.8.12.
- A revised site layout was submitted with indicated set back lines in compliance with Section 16.4.8 of the Longford County Development Plan.
- The applicant has submitted revised sightline details indicating sightlines from the proposed access towards the regional road. The planning authority considered the sightlines as submitted comply with requirements as set out in the Longford county Development Plan.
- The applicants have submitted a structural report for the structures proposed for demolition and clearance.
- The applicant states that the subject site is a brownfield site and can be considered an infill site as there are existing structures on site. The

development of the site will clear up this area for development. The planning authority agreed with these findings.

The planning authority considered owing to the applicants demonstration of a rural housing need at this location, the proposal was acceptable.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Westmeath National Roads Office

No objection to the proposal

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Eireann – no objection in principle

3.4. Third Party Observations

There is a single third party observation on file. The issues raised are also raised in the appeal. The submission can be summarised as follows:

- There has never been a dwelling at this location in the recent past.
- The current application is at variance with the general content and declarations in the recently refused application.

4.0 Planning History

PL22-285 – permission refused to Seamus Hannify 07/02/2023 for the proposed demolition of existing derelict dwelling house & outhouses together with the construction of a bungalow type dwelling house, detached garage, entrance, boundary fence/wall, onsite suitable treatment system with polishing filter and all ancillary site work. Five (5 no.) refusal reasons were stated:

1. It is the policy of the Council as set out in Section 4.8.12, CPO 4.24 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021- 2027 which identifies the criteria for applicants seeking

permission in Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence' must satisfy. It is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated a rurally generated housing need at this location and where the proposed development has the potential to impact adversely on the area. As such, the proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. The Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development, given it is not clear that the actual site meets the minimum size requirements and its resultant over-concentration of onsite treatment systems in the area, would not give rise to the risk of pollution of the water course and pose a significant threat to public health, including the health of the occupants of the proposed new dwelling and to the quality of ground and surface waters. The development, would therefore, if permitted, by itself and/or taken with adjoining developments would endanger public health and as such be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3. It is considered that the proposed development would give rise to an excessive density of development in an un-serviced rural area, thus resulting in further pressure for community and public services which would be uneconomic to provide and would, if permitted, therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

4. It is the policy of the Council as set out in Section 16.4.8, DMS 16.115 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021- 2027 which identifies the criteria for minimum building lines for all structures facing the public road. It is considered that the applicants have not demonstrated a compliance with need the distances as outline in the above police at this location and where the proposed development has the potential to impact adversely on the area. As such, the proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5. It is noted that the achievability of sightlines in relation to the proposed entrance onto the local road back toward the Regional Road have not been indicted on the submitted plans and safe unobstructed sight distances as outlined in policy DMS 16.115 cannot be achieved. It is the aim of the Planning Authority to provide a road network which is safe and efficient for all road users cognisant of the requirements of all traffic, including motorised vehicles,

pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed development, if permitted, would likely result in a hazard to all traffic, including motorised vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. As such the proposed development would likely be injurious to public health and contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

Sustainable Rural Housing – Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2005

5.2. Longford County Development Plan 2021 - 2027

5.2.1. Policy CPO 4.24 – Rural Housing

Accommodate demand from individuals for permanent residential development in defined 'Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence', subject to good planning practice, environmental carrying capacity and landscape protection considerations. Applicants seeking permission for the development of single dwelling rural housing in areas defined 'Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence' must satisfy the following criteria:

1. The applicant was born within the local rural area or is living or has lived in the local rural area for a minimum of 5 years at any stage prior to making the planning application. It includes returning emigrants seeking a permanent home in their local rural area. The 'Local Rural Area' for the purpose of this policy is defined as the area generally within an 8km radius of where the applicant was born, living or has lived. For the purpose of this policy, the rural area is taken to include 'Rural Settlement Clusters' listed in the Settlement Hierarchy, but excludes the Key Town, Self-Sustaining Growth Town, Self-Sustaining Towns, Towns and Villages and Serviced Rural Villages listed in the Settlement Hierarchy.

2. The applicant has a functional economic or social requirement to reside in this particular rural area such as in any of the following 2 situations:

(a) Economic requirements will normally encompass persons referred to in the revision to the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005 and, if applicable,

circulars. It includes persons involved in full-time farming, horticulture or forestry as well as similar rural based part-time occupations where it can be demonstrated that it is the predominant occupation.

(b) Social requirements will normally encompass persons referred to in the revision to the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines 2005 and, if applicable, circulars. Pending the making of the revised Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines by the Minister, a Functional Social Requirement in County Longford shall be taken as compliance with point 1 above. Special consideration shall be given in cases of exceptional health circumstances - supported by relevant documentation from a registered medical practitioner and a disability organisation proving that a person requires to live in a particular environment or close to family support, or requires a close family member to live in close proximity to that person.

3. The applicant does not already own or has not owned a house in the open countryside.

4. If the site is located within an Area of Special Control, there is no alternative site outside of Areas of Special Control.

5. High quality siting and design

5.2.2. Policy CPO 4.32 –

Discourage ribbon development (defined as five or more houses alongside 250 metres of road frontage). The Council will assess whether a given proposal will exacerbate such ribbon development, having regard to the following:

- a) The type of rural area and circumstances of the applicant.
- b) The degree to which the proposal might be considered infill development.
- c) The degree to which existing ribbon development would coalesce as a result of the proposed development.
- d) Local circumstances, including the planning history of the area and development pressures. Notwithstanding the above, special regard will be given to the circumstances of immediate family members of a landowner on single infill sites in a line of existing dwellings with 5 or more houses along a 250 metres of road frontage.

- 5.2.3. Policy CPO 4.57- Provide new housing in rural areas including one-off homes in accordance with the Development Plan where it meets the social and economic needs of these areas, tackles isolation, and promotes social inclusion.
- 5.2.4. DMS 16.115 - Require the following minimum building lines for all structures facing the public road:
- National Primary Road 35 metres
 - National Secondary Road 35 metres
 - Regional Road 25 metres
 - Local Road 15 metre
- 5.2.5. DMS 16.116 - New rural entrances should not be located within the following distances of junctions:
- National Primary Road 150 metres
 - National Secondary Road 100 metres
 - Regional Road 100 metres
 - Local Road 40 metres
- 5.2.6. CPO 5.98 - Ensure that private wastewater treatment plants, where permitted, are operated in compliance with EPA's. 'Promote changeover from septic tanks to public collection networks in all cases where this is feasible.'
- Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (PE. ≤10) (EPA 2009), as may be amended

5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

- Ballykenny-Fisherstown Bog SPA (004101) and Lough Forbes Complex SAC (001818) 3.6km west of the site.
- Brown Bog SAC (002346) 4.85km to the south-west.

6.0 EIA Screening

See completed form 2 on file. Having regard to the limited nature and scale of development and the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity of the site as well as the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Planning & Development Regulations there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. The need for environmental impact assessment can, therefore, be excluded at preliminary examination and a screening determination is not required.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. This is a third-party appeal against the decision of Longford County Council to grant permission. The Grounds of Appeal can be summarised as follows:

7.1.1. Planning History

- The existing planning permission should be examined in conjunction with previous planning permission 22/285. There were 5 reasons for refusal within that permission that have not been addressed in this current application.

7.1.2. Rural Housing Need

- The applicant is required to comply with County Development Plan requirements namely SN 4.8.12 and CPO 4.24 and to demonstrate that compliance. There is no transparency in the process when the documentation supplied by the applicant is not available for scrutiny. The public is denied access to information due to a misinterpretation of GDPR.
- The applicant already has a dwelling house immediately adjacent to his commercial development. There is no local need demonstrated by the applicant.

7.1.3. Over concentration of sewage treatment units in the area generally

- The same overconcentration of sewage treatment units exists as per the refusal reason under previous planning permission 22/285.

7.1.4. Ribbon Development

- The proposal contributes to ribbon development in the local area. The same issues as persist for previous reason for refusal under 22/285.

7.1.5. Minimum Building Lines

- It is stated by the planning authority that minimum building lines have been achieved, however this is not the case. The proposed dwelling is set back 15m from the regional road and not the required 25m.

7.1.6. Sightlines

- Minimum sight visibility sightlines have not been achieved contrary to the assessment of the planning authority.

7.1.7. Existing Structures

What remains of the existing structures on site is not relevant. There has been no dwelling on site in the time the applicant has resided in the area approx. 40 years. The presence of these structures should not be relevant to the assessment of this application.

7.2. **Applicant Response**

- The appellant sets out that it is proposed to construct a large fence/boundary setback on site to allow for increased visibility at the junction in a southern direction when approaching the junction from the local road. The area outside the boundary shall be transferred to the local authority to allow any further works that may be required at this junctions.
- Regarding ribbon development, the subject site relates to a site which previously had a dwelling house and which currently sits a derelict dwelling house. The replacement of existing buildings that are located on site with new dwelling and realignment of the junction will clean this area up and provide improved sight visibility at the junction. A structural report for the existing buildings on site has been provided.
- The site size is more than adequate to accommodate the proposed tertiary treatment system on site. Minimum separation distances can be complied with in accordance with Table 6.2 of the EPA code of Practice 2021.

7.3. Planning Authority Response

- None

7.4. Observations

- None

7.5. Further Responses

- None

8.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site and having regard to the relevant national and local policy guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Housing Need
- Ribbon Development
- Waste Water Treatment System
- Setback Distances/ Sightlines
- Appropriate Assessment

8.1. Housing Need

- 8.1.1. The proposed development involves the demolition of existing ruinous outbuildings and the construction of a single dwelling. The subject site is located at the junction of regional road R198 and local road L1008. To the south lies a pattern of ribbon development consisting of six dwellings. Upon review of the initial planning application, the Planning Authority was not satisfied that the proposal constituted a replacement dwelling. The applicant was therefore requested to demonstrate a rural housing need and submit the relevant supplementary application form.

- 8.1.2. The applicant has stated that he previously owned a dwelling within the rural area of Newtownforbes, where he resided with his wife and son. It is outlined that he is now separated, currently resides at his parents' home in Newtownforbes, and is seeking to construct a new dwelling to reside with his school-going son and to be proximate to his elderly parents. The justification is further supported by the assertion that the proposed location is situated along a school bus route. However, this information has been presented by way of a letter only, with no supporting documentary evidence provided in relation to current living arrangements or the applicant's separation.
- 8.1.3. The subject site is located within an area designated as being under "Strong Urban Influence" in the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027. In this regard, applicants are required to comply with Policy CPO 4.24, which outlines that individuals seeking permission for a dwelling in such areas must demonstrate a rural housing need and show evidence of residing within the rural area for a minimum of five years and within an 8km radius of the proposed site. In response to a further information request, the applicant submitted the required supplementary local needs form. It is acknowledged that the applicant is currently residing with his parents and has previously lived in the area. While the applicant cites personal and familial circumstances as justification for the proposed development, including recent separation and the need to provide care and proximity to elderly parents, no documentary evidence has been provided to substantiate these claims.
- 8.1.4. The Longford County Development Plan clearly outlines that rural housing need pertains to individuals who have not previously constructed a dwelling in the rural area. It is noted that the applicant constructed a house in the rural area during the 2007–2008 period. Moreover, the only exceptions permitted under current policy relate specifically to demonstrable and exceptional medical need. No such exceptional circumstance has been cited or evidenced in this case.
- 8.1.5. With regard to social or economic need, the applicant has stated that he is a self-employed mechanic and business owner but has not quantified the extent or localised nature of the business activity. While the applicant references the need to live near elderly parents, it is noted that the current Development Plan does not provide scope for a second rural dwelling under these circumstances in the absence of exceptional need or robust evidence. The Rural Settlement Strategy for areas under Strong Urban Influence does aim to facilitate individuals with strong intrinsic

links to the rural area, including those wishing to return to care for elderly relatives or raise families in the community where they grew up. However, the strategy must be read in conjunction with the specific provisions of Policy CPO 4.24, which remains the determining criterion in this case.

- 8.1.6. Having regard to the foregoing, it is considered that the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated a genuine rural housing need in accordance with Policy CPO 4.24 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027. The lack of substantive evidence regarding current living arrangements, marital separation, and economic activity further weakens the application. The proposal, as presented, does not comply with the requirements of the rural housing policy and cannot be supported on policy grounds.

8.2. Ribbon Development

The proposed site is located to the north of a ribbon of 5 houses on Regional Road R198. The site is a corner site at the junction of R198 and L1005, there is a house immediately to the west of the site. Access to the site is off local road L1005, with the front of the dwelling angled towards the regional road, keeping a similar building line to existing houses to the south of the site. I note the area to the east of the site is under extensive pressure for one-off housing. The planning authority did not consider the applicant qualified for a replacement dwelling in this instance and qualified to build a house under Rural Housing need criteria as set out under policy CP0-24. _Ribbon development, as defined in the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005), is characterised by the presence of 5 or more houses along a given 250 meters of road frontage. I consider the proposed development falls within the definition of ribbon development.

Having regard to the existing structures on site which are in a derelict/ ruinous condition, I do not consider that the presence of these structures mitigates against ribbon development. Policy CPO 4.32 of the Longford County Development Plan seeks to discourage to ribbon development defined as five or more houses along 250 metres of road frontage. The evolving development pattern along the road serving the site aligns with the characteristics of ribbon development and in my view exacerbates ribbon development along this stretch of road. As per Policy CPO 4.32

the assessment of ribbon development makes references to dwelling houses only, there is no evidence provided in the application to indicate that the existing structures ever formed part of a dwelling house. I note the policy seeks to allow ribbon development in exceptional circumstances, in my view exceptional circumstances have not been provided by the applicant to reside at this location

8.2.1. Given the prevalence of one-off rural dwellings in the area, the proposed addition of another dwelling contributes to existing pressures on rural housing at this location. The proposal meets the criteria for ribbon development and it does represent an increase in urban-generated housing, exacerbating existing pressures in the area. Consequently, I find the development to be at variance with policy CPO 4.32, where Longford County Council aims to support a balanced approach to rural development, by limiting the potential for ribbon development.

8.2.2. It is imperative to protect areas under strong urban influence as outlined in the Longford County Development Plan. I do not consider that a grant of permission aligns with policies to protect areas under urban influence or to be a balanced approach to rural development as necessitated by the above policy. Having regard to the above I recommend planning permission be refused.

8.3. Wastewater Treatment System

8.3.1. The Site Characterisation Report submitted with the application identifies that the subject site is located in an area with a Locally Important Aquifer where the bedrock vulnerability is Moderate. A ground protection response to R1 is noted. Accordingly, I note the suitability of the site for a treatment system (subject to normal good practice, i.e. system selection, construction, operation and maintenance). The applicant's Site Characterisation Report identifies that there is no Groundwater Protection Scheme in the area.

8.3.2. The trial hole depth referenced in the Site Characterisation Report was 2.1 metres. Bedrock was not encountered, the water table was encountered at 1.9m. The soil conditions found in the trial hole are described as comprising silt/clay and silty sand. Percolation test holes were dug and pre-soaked. A T value/sub-surface value of 29.97 was recorded. A P surface test provided indicates 36.47.

Table 6.3 of the EPA CoP 2021 requires a minimum depth of unsaturated permeable subsoil of 0.9 metres below the base of the polishing filter for secondary treatment systems. It is proposed to pump the effluent from the proposed wastewater treatment system to a Ecoflo Coco Filter which will then discharge via gravity onto a stone pad of 100m². This has been demonstrated in an attached site layout. This aligns with Table 10.1 of the EPA Code of practice.

- 8.3.3. There is no foul sewer network located in this area and all of the adjacent dwellings would appear to be served by septic tanks or wastewater treatment systems. Whilst it is likely that separation distances comply the EPA Code of Practice 2021 for individual wastewater treatment systems given the generous plot sizes in the area, the issue of proliferation of individual treatment systems is of concern. However given the proposed treatment methodology for a secondary waste water treatment system and indication of separation distances as per Table 6.2 of the EPA Code of Practice 2021, I consider the applicant has demonstrated the site is suitable for the treatment of wastewater in this instance.
- 8.3.4. Based on the submitted information and reference to Groundwater Data Ireland, it has been demonstrated that the proposed wastewater treatment system, complies with the EPA Code of Practice Guidance in terms of ground conditions and separation distance. I note the planning authority conclude that the site is suitable for the treatment of wastewater. I consider the proposal to install a wastewater treatment system in this instance to be acceptable.

8.4. Setback Distances/ Sightlines.

- 8.4.1. The previous reason for refusal as cited by Longford County Council was that the setback distance of the proposed dwelling from the regional road and local road was not in accordance with requirements of DM Standard 16.115. The appellant states the layout as provided by the applicant in this instance has not changed since original reason for refusal and therefore no evidence as been presented with which to overturn this decision. I note as part of response to further information the applicant has supplied a revised site layout, received by Longford County Council on the 29th of November 2024. The proposed new dwelling shall be setback off the

regional road 25m and off the local road 16.6m. Regarding setback distances, I consider the proposal is in line with DM Standard 16.115.

8.4.2. Regarding Sightlines, the previous refusal reason sets out that the applicant failed to demonstrate adequate sightlines to the east towards the regional road. The applicant has demonstrated sightlines of 50m in an easterly direction. The proposed entrance is off a local road towards a regional road where the general speed limit of 60kmph applies. DMS 16.114 is the informing guideline for the assessment of sightlines from new entrances within the Longford County Development Plan. I note for 60kmph speed a sightline of 65m is required 2.4m setback off the road edge. The policy does allow for discretion to be used where the travelling speeds or site circumstances allow for reduced sightlines. As the proposal is at an approach to a junction where speeds are generally reduced, I consider the sightline of 50m to be acceptable in this instance. There is no remedial works to achieve sightlines and the boundary at this location is made up of low scrub with little maintenance required. I note report from Westmeath national roads office indicating no objection to the proposal on grounds of sightlines.

8.4.3. I also note a further assessment tool for sightlines as required for new rural entrances under DM Standard 16.115 of the Longford County Development Plan.

New rural entrances should not be located within the following distances of junctions:

- National Primary Road 150 metres
- National Secondary Road 100 metres
- Regional Road 100 metres
- Local Road 40 metres

The proposed new entrance is located 50m from the junction with regional road R198. In my view the proposal does not accord with setback distance for new rural entrances as set out under DM Standard 16.115, however the only other alternative access to the site is via the regional road. In my view, the proposed entrance is at the most advantageous location in terms of site safety and ease of access.

Furthermore as per my assessment under Section 8.5.2 above, speed limits from the junction will be reduced well below the 60kmph in real terms as any turn off onto the local road will require at a minimum cars to yield, therefore reducing speed. In my

view the issue of setback distances or sightlines are not substantive issues with which to warrant a refusal of permission in this instance.

8.5. AA Screening

- 8.5.1. I have considered the proposed development at Cahanagh, Newtownforbes, Longford in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, as amended.

The subject site is located c 3.6km west of Ballykenny-Fisherstown Bog SPA (004101). There are no drainage ditches or watercourses in the vicinity of the development site that provide direct connectivity to European sites. Article 10 of the Habitats Directive and the Habitats Regulations 2011 place a high degree of importance on such non-Natura 2000 areas as features that connect the Natura 2000 network. Features such as ponds, woodlands and important hedgerows were taken into account in the decision process.

- 8.5.2. The proposed development comprises the construction of a dwelling on lands on a brownfield site in a rural area at Cahanagh, Newtownforbes .

- 8.5.3. 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 nature and small scale of the development,
- The location of the development site and distance from nearest European site(s), and the weakness of connectivity between the development site and European sites.
- Taking account of the screening report/determination by the Planning Authority.

- 8.5.4. 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.

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

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. Having regard to the location of the site within "Area Under Strong Urban Influence" as identified in Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities issued by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in April 2005 and in an area where housing is restricted to persons demonstrating local need in accordance with the Longford County Development Plan 2021 - 2027, it is considered that the applicant does not come within the scope of the housing need criteria as set out in the Guidelines or the Development Plan for a house at this location. The proposed development, in the absence of any identified locally based need for the house, would contribute to the encroachment of random rural development in the area and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and the efficient provision of public services and infrastructure. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
2. It is the policy (CPO-4.32) of the planning authority as set out in the Longford County Development Plan 2021 to 2027 to control urban sprawl and ribbon development. This policy is considered to be reasonable. The proposed development would be in conflict with policy CPO -4.32 because, when taken in conjunction with existing development in the vicinity of the site, it would consolidate and contribute to the build-up of ribbon development in an open rural area. This would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and lead to demands for the provision of further public services and community facilities. The proposed development would, therefore, 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.

Darragh Ryan
Planning Inspector

16th of April 2025

Form 1

EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	321603-25		
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a dwelling		
Development Address	Cahanagh, Newtownforbes, Longford		
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)		Yes	X
		No	
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?			
Yes	X	Class 10 (b) (i) Part 2, Schedule 5. Construction of more than 500 dwelling units	Proceed to Q3.
No			
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?			
Yes			
No	X		Proceed to Q4

4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?			
Yes	X	. Construction of more than 500 dwelling units	Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2

EIA Preliminary Examination

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	ABP-321603-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a dwelling
Development Address	Cahanagh, Newtownforbes, Longford
<p>The Board carried out a preliminary examination [ref. Art. 109(2)(a), Planning and Development regulations 2001, as amended] of at least the nature, size or location of the proposed development, having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations.</p> <p>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</p>	
<p>Characteristics of proposed development</p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>Development of single dwelling of 189.42sqm and construction of a grage. The site is located on a brownfiled site in a rural area. There would be no construction impacts beyond that for the construction of a single dwelling.</p>
<p>Location of development</p> <p>(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).</p>	<p>The site is located at a distance removed from any water body. The site is 3.6km from nearest European site. There is no likely significant effect on any European site as a result of the proposed development.</p>

Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).		The site is located within a rural environment . There is no other construction presently in the vicinity of the site. There is no concern in relations to a cumulative or transboundary effect owing to nature and size of the proposed development which is located on a limited site.
Conclusion		
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA	Yes or No
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.	No – EIA is not required
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.		
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.		

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____

Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)