



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-321808-25

Development	House and associated site works.
Location	Newtown, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford.
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460449
Applicant(s)	Jack & Olive O'Donnell
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refusal
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Jack & Olive O'Donnell
Observer(s)	TII
Date of Site Inspection	22 April 2025
Inspector	Natalie de Róiste

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	3
2.0 Proposed Development	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 The Appeal	10
7.0 Assessment.....	13
8.0 AA Screening.....	15
9.0 Recommendation.....	15
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	15
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The application site (measuring c.0.4 hectares) is part of an agricultural field on a farm in the townland of Newtown, c. 3 kilometres south of Dungarvan. It forms part of a larger landholding to the south (some 63 hectares, shown in the blue line boundary) which is bordered to the north by agricultural lands, to the west by the N25 road, to the south by the River Brickey, and to the east by Dungarvan Harbour. There is an existing farmhouse and farmyard on this landholding, adjacent to the road, to the south of the appeal site.
- 1.2. The site is accessed by an entrance giving onto the N25, a national primary road with a speed limit of 100 km, connecting Cork to Waterford and Rosslare. There is a veterinary practice located opposite the entrance.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a single- and two-storey four-bedroom house of 241 sqm, with a septic tank and all associated works accessed via a wayleave over part of the existing farmhouse driveway. It is proposed to remove a section of an existing farm outbuilding to improve the sightlines from the existing farm entrance.
- 2.2. As part of a Further Information submission, the applicant submitted that there were four existing farm entrances to the farm (over and above the entrance to the farmhouse), and that they were prepared to permanently close two of these four entrances as part of the development.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

Refused for the following reason:

The proposal would give rise to an intensification of an existing entrance on a section of the N25, National Primary Route, where the maximum permitted speed limit (100km/h) applies, resulting in a negative impact on the traffic

safety and carrying capacity of this National Road. It is considered that the proposed development, by itself and the precedent it would set, would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028 namely Policy Objectives Trans 39 and Trans 41, and be contrary to the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2012 which seek to avoid the creation of any additional access point from new developments or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60kph apply. The proposed development would therefore give rise to a traffic hazard due to the movement of extra traffic generated and establish an undesirable precedent for similar type development contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

- Planner's report dated 27 September 2024 noted the site location and pre-planning meeting, comments from TII, Development Plan policy, and natural heritage designations. It noted the applicant's local housing needs, and acceptability of the house design, and suitability for a standard septic tank and percolation area. It noted extensive alterations would be required to boundary treatment as well as removal of part of outbuilding. Given the proposed direct access onto the N25, it recommended further information on compliance with policy on site entrance, and on any undisclosed alternative family lands which have frontage on a lower class road, or the possibility of a redevelopment of the existing family home.
- Planner's report of 10 January 2025 noted the applicant's detailed response on policy on site entrance, with no further details submitted on other landholdings. The report refers to planning history 23/60232 as evidence of family landholdings with road frontage onto local roads. The report noted the applicant's response; that building on a different landholding would increase traffic movements into the existing substandard entrance, and risk animal welfare issues, and there was no possibility of a redevelopment of the existing family home. A refusal was recommended.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- None on file.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

TII - refusal recommended. The proposal would generate increased traffic from existing access point to national road, where the maximum permitted speed limit applies, contrary to the *Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (January 2012)*. The proposal would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users, due to the movement of the extra traffic generated.

3.4. Third Party Observations

None on file.

4.0 Planning History

- On site – 24/60331 – invalid application re same development.
- The planner's report also cited 23/60232 as a relevant application. No history file was provided by the Local Authority. A search of the online planning register (accessed 2 May 2025) showed this was an application for a house in a neighbouring townland, some 800 metres to the north. In indicating their social need to live in the area, one of the applicants indicated the same family home as that shown on the current application.
- The appellant cites the following as precedent:

ABP-301403-18 reg ref 17/606

Tullamaine (Ashbrook), Callan, Co. Kilkenny: following a third party appeal by TII, the Board granted permission for a two-storey dwelling, which shared an entrance with a farmyard onto the N76, subject to the closure of four field entrances and a farmyard entrance.

- Planning applications in the vicinity:

25/60257 – live application for extension to veterinary clinic, Middlequarter, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford (across the road from subject site).

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. Under the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022 – 2028 the subject site is located within the Dungarvan & Ballinroad Settlement Boundary, and zoned 'High Amenity' with a stated objective to 'protect highly sensitive and scenic location from inappropriate development that would adversely affect the environmental quality of the locations'.
- 5.1.2. The subject site is situated within an 'Area Under Strong Urban Influence' in the current rural housing policy of the Development Plan.
- 5.1.3. The site is situated within a 'Most Sensitive' Scenic Classification in the Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment as per the Development Plan and the site is on a 'Scenic Route'.
- 5.1.4. Chapter 5 Deals with Transport and Mobility, and contains the following policy objectives of relevance:

Policy Objective Trans 39 - We will maintain and protect the strategic transport function and capacity of motorways and the national roads and associated junctions in accordance with the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines (2012) and the Trans-European Networks (TEN-T) Regulations.

Policy Objective Trans 40 - We will support the role of TII with regard to the upgrade of existing National Routes, such as the Dungarvan Bypass (N25) and Dungarvan to Mallow upgrade (N72), and where appropriate restrict development immediately adjacent to national routes and interchange[s] in order to facilitate future enlargement of the Interchange.

Policy Objective Trans 41 - National Roads: Avoid the creation of any additional access points from new development or the material increase in traffic using existing access points to National Roads, to which a speed limit of greater than 60 kph applies in accordance with the requirements set out in the Spatial Planning and National Road Guidelines, DECLG (2012).[]

Policy Objective Trans 43 - The Council will seek to conduct a strategic review of the N25 with a view to identifying locations for upgrading the existing national route to

provide grade separated junction and reduce the hazardous right-hand turn movements.

- 5.1.5. Chapter 7 Housing & Sustainable Communities has a number of policy objectives of relevance to rural housing:

Policy Objective H 24 – Rural Housing Policy Objectives – General

We will support the sustainable development of rural areas by encouraging growth and arresting decline in areas that have experienced low population growth or decline in recent decades and by managing the growth of areas that are under strong urban influence to avoid over-development, while sustaining vibrant rural communities.

Policy Objective H 28 - New Homes in the Open Countryside Policy Objectives

We will facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside, in rural areas under urban influence, based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic, social or local need to live in a rural area, as well as general siting and design criteria (34) as set out in this plan and in relevant statutory planning guidelines, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.

Policy Objective H 30 - Housing in High Amenity Areas and Approach Roads

On lands zoned High Amenity and along the approach roads to settlements we will:

- Discourage inappropriate development which would threaten the maintenance of a clear demarcation between the rural and built up areas, encourage and exacerbate urban sprawl and detract from the landscape/ rural character of the area; and,*
- Provide for uses such as agriculture and forestry, sport and recreation and essential public services installations.*

We will facilitate development proposals by existing landowners with a genuine demonstrable economic, social or local need for a first home for their own permanent occupation, subject to consideration of available alternatives and sequential testing, as well as general siting and design criteria as set out in this plan and in relevant statutory planning guidelines.

- 5.1.6. Chapter 11 Heritage has a number of policy objectives regarding vernacular buildings and farmyards, including the following:

Policy Objective BH 24 Maintaining and Enhancing our Vernacular Buildings

It is the policy of the Council to:

- Protect, maintain and enhance the historic character and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements*
- Encourage appropriate revitalisation and reuse of such structures (see rural diversification/ tourism). There will be a presumption against the demolition of vernacular buildings where restoration or adaptation is a feasible option.*
- Promote the protection and maintenance of thatched buildings (domestic or non-domestic), particularly those with historic layers and roof structures.*

Policy Objective BH 26 Reuse of Vernacular Structures

It is a policy of the council to encourage and facilitate the sensitive reuse of vernacular houses or farm buildings for farm diversification, agri-tourism and rural development, including self-catering accommodation, arts or craft workshops and small-scale manufacturing. Guidance and information can be found in Traditional Buildings for Irish Farms (2005) published by the Heritage Council and Teagasc, and Reusing Farm Buildings: A Kildare Perspective (2006) published by Kildare County Council.

Policy Objective BH 27 Retaining Vernacular Structures in Rural Areas

It is the policy of the Council where proposals for sensitive rehabilitation of disused vernacular buildings in the open countryside are being considered they will not be required to establish a rural housing need provided that their vernacular character is enhanced and that their fabric is repaired using appropriate techniques and materials. Where the subject structure is demolished and replaced a rural housing need will be required.

Policy Objective BH 28 Demolition of Vernacular Structures

It is the policy of the Council to ensure that where permission is sought to demolish a structure which is considered of vernacular significance, on the grounds of structural defects or failure, or that it is not reasonably capable of being made structurally sound, the developer will be required to submit a report by a professional with appropriate conservation expertise and an understanding of vernacular buildings which demonstrate substantial reasons for the demolition. It must be satisfactorily

demonstrated that every effort has been made to continue the present use or find a suitable new use for the structure(s).

- 5.1.7. Volume 2 deals with Development Management Standards, and has the following policy of relevance:

Development Management DM 45

It is therefore a policy of the Council to avoid the creation of any additional access point from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60 kmh apply, in accordance with Government Policy as outlined within the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2012) issued by the DoECLG. This provision applies to all categories of development including houses in rural areas, regardless of the housing circumstance of the applicant.

5.2. National Guidelines

- Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities January 2012

Section 2.5 Required Development Plan Policy on Access to National Roads

With regard to access to national roads, all development plans and any relevant local area plans must implement the policy approaches outlined below. Lands adjoining National Roads to which speed limits greater than 60 kmh apply: The policy of the planning authority will be to avoid the creation of any additional access point from new development or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60 kmh apply. This provision applies to all categories of development, including individual houses in rural areas, regardless of the housing circumstances of the applicant.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

Dungarvan Harbour SPA 004032 – 0.3 km south west

pNHA Dungarvan Harbour – 0.3 km south west

5.4. EIA Screening

See completed Form 2 on file. 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received, on behalf of the applicant, against the refusal. Issues raised were as follows:

- The applicants for the house are a married couple, one of whom is the farmer of the fully operational dairy and cattle farm. The site access is not a new access, but the access to the existing farm residence, where the applicants currently reside with the farmer's family of origin. The access would provide the required 215 metre sightline, by setting back/demolishing the gable wall of the existing farm outbuilding.
- The decision to refuse is irrational and contradictory, with little regard paid to the particulars of the application, and the refusal jeopardises the future sustainable operation of the farm.
- This is a bona fide application to provide a permanent home for the farmer and his wife. By the farm's particular nature, he is required to provide on-farm animal supervision 24/7.
- TII claim the development would be at variance with national policy in relation to control of frontage development on national roads; it would result in the intensification of an existing direct access to a national road; and it would endanger public safety by reason of traffic hazard and obstruction of road users.

- The development is not road frontage development; takes access from an existing established private driveway, and does not create any intensification; and the development would improve sightlines (which were approved and provided by WCC during a previous N25 upgrade/realignment).
- The Further Information request which issued was an erroneous application of planning policy and guideline controls, and the suggestion to redevelop the family home to provide ancillary accommodation was contradictory and nonsensical, as there would be no difference in terms of intensification. The proposal to consider an alternative site (on lands that the applicant does not own) would increase traffic movements into the existing substandard entrance.
- The planners have placed undue emphasis on the TII objection, given the specifics of the application (a genuine farmer's housing need), and have failed to take into account the improvements to the sightlines, and the closing off of two existing accesses.
- No credence has been given to precedent (planning reference 17606, Kilkenny County Council) which permitted a new home on family land, with access onto the N76 through an existing entrance, with the closure of 4 existing agricultural entrances. This was appealed by TII, and the grant confirmed by the Board (ABP PL 10. 301403)

6.2. Planning Authority Response

None received.

6.3. Observations

One received, from Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII). This is summarised below:

- TII reiterates the policy set out in the Ministerial Guidelines 'Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities' to avoid creating additional access points and avoid increasing traffic from existing accesses, on national roads with speed limits greater than 60 km. This provision applies

to two categories of development, including houses in rural areas, regardless of the housing circumstances of the applicant.

- TII considers that the development, if permitted, will inevitably bring about additional vehicular turning movements, resulting in intensification of use, contrary to the policy and provisions of the guidelines, which are designed to protect the public investment in national roads. The National Planning Framework contains an objective to maintain the strategic capacity and safety of the national roads network including planning for future capacity enhancements.
- This intensification arises from trips associated with both applicants in their day-to-day occupation and patterns of activity, but also trips generated by other services, utilities, visitors, etc. This intensification would give rise to additional turning movements that introduce additional safety risks to road users.
- It appears from a review of the documents that alternative access to the local road network from family lands may be available.
- This is a highly trafficked national primary road, the strategic N25, part of the EU TEN-T (Trans-European Transport Network), and Section 2.6 of the DoECLG Guidelines (which provide a less restrictive approach to lightly trafficked secondary roads) does not apply.
- More deaths from road traffic collisions occur on a small proportion of roads where traffic volumes and speed limits are higher and where there is a mix of speeds and motorised and non-motorised traffic. The Road Safety Authority highlight that road safety plays an integral part in decision-making, and it is incumbent on public authorities to focus on all elements of the road traffic system to improve road safety. TII considers that restricting direct access and intensification of direct access to the high-speed national road network can, and does, contribute to a reduction in collisions and fatalities.

7.0 Assessment

7.1.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal and the report of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Traffic Impacts
- Impacts on Heritage (new issue)

7.2. Traffic Impacts

7.3. The appeal states that there would be no intensification of use as a result of the construction of the new house, as the applicants currently live on the farm, in the original family farm house, and use the existing entrance. Furthermore, it is stated that an off-farm home would generate more traffic through the existing entrance, as the farmer is obliged to provide on-farm animal supervision 24/7. However, I consider that the construction of a new house would – in the medium and long term – constitute an intensification of use, over and above the existing situation. The applicant's agent noted in the Further Information response that the applicants have a reasonable expectation of establishing an independent home as a couple, for themselves and their potential family, and that remaining in the family home is not a long-term solution, or the intention of the couple. The construction of a new four-bedroom house on the landholding would increase the residential capacity of the landholding, and create an intensification of use in the medium to long term. While an off-farm home would create traffic movements between the farm and that house, it would avoid the additional traffic movements associated with domestic life, education, and off-farm work occupations.

7.4. Notwithstanding the bona fides of the applicant as a working farmer, the Ministerial Guidelines specifically and categorically state that the policy of avoiding the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses '*applies to all categories of development, including individual houses in rural areas, regardless of the housing circumstances of the applicant*'.

- 7.5. In relation to traffic safety, I note the speed limit on the road (100 km/h), the heavy traffic on the date of the site visit, the commercial premises opposite, and the lack of any ghost island or turning lane at this point. In my view, the intensification of the use of this entrance would constitute a traffic hazard, and would interfere with the free flow of traffic on this national route which connects Cork to Waterford and Rosslare Harbour.
- 7.6. Regarding the proposal to close off two long standing agricultural access points on the N25 associated with the farm, these gates give access from fields onto the grass margin, and there is no indication that they are used for vehicular access. I do not consider that the proposal to close off access to the fields would offset the safety concerns associated with the proposed development, which would generate new turning movements onto and off a heavily trafficked national route.
- 7.7. Regarding the precedent cited by the appellant (ABP-301403-18 in Kilkenny), I have consulted that file. I note that that location was materially different, with adequate sightlines from the existing entrance, and no opposing entrance.
- 7.8. Having regard to Development Plan policy and national policy, I consider the Planning Authority's reason for refusal reasonable, and recommend a refusal.
- 7.9. **Impacts on Heritage (new issue)**
- 7.9.1. This development includes the partial demolition of a vernacular building, a double-height whitewashed rubble stone shed, with a pitched slate roof and a carriage arch with stone dressings. The planner's report notes no referral to, or internal reports from, the conservation office, despite Development Plan policy objectives on maintaining, enhancing, reusing, and retaining vernacular structures (noted above under policy context).
- 7.9.2. In my view, the outbuilding is of vernacular significance, and part of a farmyard group with the house and the stone wall (the latter of which would also require removal). Given the policy objective set out in BH 24 of the Development Plan, which is to protect, maintain and enhance the historic character and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements, and the presumption against the demolition of vernacular buildings, insufficient justification has been put forward for the partial demolition of the structure and the amendments to the boundary, and insufficient

information has been supplied on the boundary to be reinstated. Given that the development is proposed on a Scenic Route and within a 'Most Sensitive' area (as per the Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment), I have concerns regarding the visual impacts of this aspect of the development; I note that the proposed new house would be visible only in very localised views.

- 7.9.3. This is not an issue that was raised in the planner's report, and as such the applicant has not had an opportunity to address it in their appeal, and the Board may wish to seek the views of the parties. However, having regard to the substantive reason for refusal set out below, it may not be considered necessary to pursue the matter.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. The Planning Authority's report screened out appropriate assessment. The site is located approximately 0.3 km north/northwest of the Dungarvan Harbour SPA (also a pNHA), which is also located within 1 kilometre to the south and east. It is considered that the hydrological connection to the Dungarvan Harbour SPA is indirect, weak and sufficiently remote. Foul and surface runoff will be treated and contained on site. Having regard to ground conditions and site characterisation assessment, it is considered that adequate treatment can be achieved on site.
- 8.2. Having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the nature of the foreseeable emissions therefrom, the distance from the nearest European site and the absence of pathways between the application site and any European site it is possible to screen out the requirement for the submission of an NIS at an initial stage.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend permission be refused for the following reason:

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The proposal would give rise to an intensification of an existing entrance on a section of the N25, National Primary Route, where the maximum permitted speed limit (100km/h) applies, resulting in a negative impact on the traffic

safety and carrying capacity of this National Road. It is considered that the proposed development, by itself and the precedent it would set, would be contrary to the policies and objectives of the Waterford City & County Development Plan 2022-2028 namely Policy Objectives Trans 39 and Trans 41, and be contrary to the Spatial Planning and National Roads Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2012 which seek to avoid the creation of any additional access point from new developments, or the generation of increased traffic from existing accesses, to national roads to which speed limits greater than 60kph apply. The proposed development would therefore give rise to a traffic hazard due to the movement of extra traffic generated and establish an undesirable precedent for similar type development 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.

Natalie de Róiste
Planning Inspector

12 May 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-321808-25
Proposed Development Summary	Rural house and associated site works
Development Address	Newtown, Dungarvan, Waterford
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. <input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold

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

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-321808-25
Proposed Development Summary	Rural house and associated site works
Development Address	Newtown, Dungarvan, Waterford
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 (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>The proposed development is a dwelling house, and water treatment plant, and partial demolition of an outbuilding. There are existing dwelling houses and farm buildings in the proximity of the site. The proposed development would not be exceptional in size or design in the context.</p> <p>The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants</p>
Location of development (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>The development would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other rural developments.</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).	<p>The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants, and there is no potential for significant effects, either by itself or cumulatively with other developments.</p>
Conclusion	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)