



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321926-25

Development	Construction of extension and replacement of existing septic tank together with all associated site works.
Location	Coollisduff, Kilmaine, Co. Mayo.
Planning Authority	Mayo County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24316
Applicant(s)	Pat Ryan
Type of Application	Planning Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission with conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Kevin & Ciara Heneghan
Date of Site Inspection	16 th May 2024
Inspector	Sarah O'Mahony

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The 0.1586ha site comprises a detached single storey, pitched roof dwelling with a floorspace of 82.5m² situated in a rural area 3.3km west of Kilmaine and 4km southeast of Ballinrobe. The dwelling is in poor condition with many broken windows and missing slates and has the appearance of being vacant with an extended period of time. Boundaries comprise a mix of masonry and rubble walls along the roadside (north) and eastern boundary with post and wire fencing to the west and a blockwork wall to the rear which forms part of the yard associated with an adjacent barn outside the site but immediately adjacent to the rear boundary.
- 1.2. Vehicular and pedestrian access is provided from the L1613 along the front (northern) boundary of the site. This local road connects to the N84 840m to the east. Adjacent land is predominantly in agricultural use with some low density detached dwellings. There is an agricultural laneway situated adjacent the western boundary which provides another vehicular access to the site as well as to the barn and another farmyard to the southwest. The closest dwelling is situated immediately west of the laneway.
- 1.3. The Clyard Kettle Holes Special Area of Conservation comprises three fragmented turloughs which are situated 320m to the southwest and 420m southeast at their closest points to the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for development which comprises the following:
 - Refurbish and extend the existing dwelling including:
 - Demolition of 15.5m² comprising a flat roof porch to the front and a lean-to annex to the rear and
 - Construction of 107.5m² additional floorspace to the side and rear in the form of a new pitched roof L-shaped extension while maintaining the original narrow plan pitched roof structure.
 - A new flat roof porch will be provided on the front elevation.

- The revised internal floorplan will retain 4no. bedrooms as is currently in situ, but each bedroom will be larger with a different layout. 2no. new en-suites and significantly larger kitchen/dining and living spaces are also proposed.
- Upgrade the existing wastewater treatment system by decommissioning the septic tank and provide a new on-site treatment system including tertiary treatment and a 100m² polishing filter.
- Widening the existing vehicular entrance and
- Additional landscaping including a new stone faced 1m high blockwork wall along the western boundary to the agricultural laneway, a native hedgerow to the northern boundary alongside the road and a patio outside the northwest corner of the new extension.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Further Information

- 3.1.1. The Planning Authority sought the preparation and submission of assessment under Article 6 of the EU Habitat Directive in order to enable the Planning Authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment screening exercise. The request specified that the assessment should address whether there is a hydraulic connection between the application site and any nearby Natura 2000 site, especially having regard to the site's failed EPA site suitability assessment. A second item was also requested asking the Applicant to confirm if any other lands are available in this location in which to provide an enlarged site or provide an alternative location for the wastewater treatment system. This request was made on foot of the proposed wastewater treatment upgrade as the Site Characterisation Form demonstrated that the site failed the percolation test.
- 3.1.2. The Applicant responded by clarifying that no other lands were available. An Appropriate Assessment Screening Report was also submitted which confirmed there is no hydraulic connection between the site and the nearby Clyard Kettle holes SAC and no impacts are predicted to the SAC as the proposed tertiary wastewater treatment would ensure wastewater discharges are very low in potential

contaminants. The requirement to carry out a stage 2 Appropriate Assessment was screened out by the Planning Authority.

3.2. Decision

- 3.2.1. A notification to grant permission was issued by Mayo County Council on 29th January 2025 subject to 5no. conditions including no. 2 as follows:

“2. (a) The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application on 31st July 2024 and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” - Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

b) Treated effluent from the treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” - Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.

c) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report to Mayo County Council from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.

Reason: In the interests of public health and to prevent water pollution.”

3.3. Planning Authority Reports

3.3.1. Planning Reports

- There are two reports on file, one requesting further information and the latter assessing the response.
- The Planners report recommendation to grant permission is consistent with the notification of decision which issued.

- Appropriate Assessment (AA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) issues are both screened out.
- The report considered the dwelling design and access alterations to be acceptable. Following receipt of the further information response, the proposed wastewater treatment system was deemed acceptable as it would improve the quality of discharges and therefore reduce environmental impacts compared to utilising the current septic tank system.

3.3.2. Other Technical Reports

- Area Engineer: No objection subject to standard conditions regarding surfacing and drainage materials for the entrance and hardstanding area to the front of the site.
- Water Services Office: Report received highlighting that the vicinity of the proposed development is served by a Group Water Scheme.

3.4. Prescribed Bodies

The decision was referred to the following however no response was received.

- Uisce Eireann
- An Taisce
- Development Applications Unit

3.5. Third Party Observations

3.5.1. One observation received from Kevin Heneghan which raised the following matters:

- The site is insufficient to cater for the upgraded wastewater treatment system.
- Separation distances in accordance with the EPA Code of Practice cannot be achieved.
- The proposal failed the EPA percolation testing procedure.
- Concern regarding impacts to adjacent dwelling, farmyard and SAC.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1.1. No known planning history on the site.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The site is governed by the policies and provisions contained in the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 (referred to hereafter as the CDP).

- 5.1.2. Objective RHO 10 states the following:

“To require that any proposal to extend/refurbish an existing rural dwelling house, occupied or otherwise, takes account of the siting and size of the existing building and endeavours to ensure that the design, scale and materials used in the refurbishment and/or extension are in keeping and sympathetic with the existing structure and that mature landscape features are retained and enhanced, as appropriate.”

- 5.1.3. Objective INO 8 states the following:

“To require development in unsewered areas which includes a septic tank/proprietary effluent treatment unit and percolation area to be rigorously assessed in accordance with the accepted EPA Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses or the EPA Wastewater Treatment Manuals Treatment Systems for Small Communities, Business, Leisure Centres and Hotels, taking into account the cumulative effects of existing and proposed developments in the area”

- 5.1.4. Volume 2 of the CDP sets out Development Management Standards and Section 2.7 provides the following guidance:

“Rural Housing Extensions shall:

- In general, be subordinate to the existing dwelling in its size, unless in exceptional cases, a larger extension compliments the existing dwelling in its design and massing.*

- *Reflect the window proportions, detailing and finishes, texture, materials and colour of the existing dwelling, unless a high quality contemporary and innovatively designed extension is proposed.*
- *Not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties through undue overlooking, undue overshadowing and/or an over dominant visual impact.*
- *Carefully consider site coverage to avoid unacceptable loss of private open space.*

Where an extension increases the potential occupancy of the dwelling, the adequacy of the on-site sewage treatment (in unsewered areas) should be demonstrated by the applicant.”

5.2. EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems

5.2.1. The purpose of the Code of Practice (CoP) is to provide guidance on domestic waste water treatment systems (DWWTSs) for single houses or equivalent developments with a population equivalent (PE) of less than or equal to 10. It sets out a methodology for site assessment and selection, installation and maintenance of an appropriate DWWTS.

5.2.2. Section 1.3 states

“Adoption without modification of the specifications in this document may not, in all circumstances, be appropriate.

....

Existing DWWTSs may not meet the performance requirements as set out in this CoP. If existing DWWTSs are being upgraded, variances to the requirements set out within this CoP may be considered by the local authority where the authority is satisfied that the proposed upgrade will protect human health and the environment.”

5.2.3. Section 2.2 states:

“If retrofitting existing systems that do not comply with this CoP, where the site is unsuitable, the proposed upgrade must provide improved treatment and

reduced environmental impact as in many cases site improvement works will not be sufficient to enable the site to be used for a system incorporating discharge to ground.”

5.2.4. Section 2.5 states: “*Regard should be had to the CoP but it may not be possible to meet requirements fully.*”

5.2.5. Table 6.2 set sets out required minimum separation distances from various features such as wells, karst features, dwellings and watercourses etc. Section 6.3 states:

“If any of these requirements cannot be met on a new site, the site is not suitable for the installation of a DWWTS. Refer to Sections 1.3 and 2.2 in relation to potential variances to the requirements set out within this CoP where existing DWWTSs are being upgraded and cannot meet requirements.”

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

5.3.1. The Clyard Kettle Holes Special Area of Conservation and proposed Natural Heritage Area comprises four fragmented turloughs which are situated 320m to the southwest and 420m southeast at their closest points to the site.

5.4. EIA Screening

The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads Regulations). No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. Refer to Form 1 in Appendix 1 of report.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal is received from Kevin and Ciara Heneghan which raises the following matters:

- Wastewater treatment concerns – the site is insufficient to provide an appropriate treatment system as minimum separation distances cannot be accommodated. The

proposal failed the site characterisation process. Concerns that wastewater would impact the adjoining farm, dwelling and Special Area of Conservation.

- Request to confirm how topographical data was utilised as there are concerns that wastewater would enter the public road and agricultural property to the north opposite the site.

6.2. Applicant Response

- The existing septic tank is situated on the boundary of the site and has potential to overflow into adjacent property.
- All efforts were made during preparation of the application to improve the effluent treatment process and protect groundwater.
- The Site Suitability Report indicates the site is suitable for on-site treatment and recommends a tertiary process which gives a much higher level of treatment prior to discharge.
- The distribution pad would be situated 1.1m below ground level and below the adjacent road level.
- All minimum separation distances will be adhered to.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- No response received.

7.0 Assessment

7.1. Introduction

- 7.1.1. The proposed development comprises altering and extending an existing dwelling while retaining the original pitched roof structure. No issues were raised in the appeal or the Case Planners report regarding the principle, design, layout or access matters etc all of which I consider to be acceptable and appropriate for the site and rural area. In my opinion the proposed extension complies with the requirements of

Section 2.7 of the Development Management Standards as well as Objective RHO 10 of the CDP.

7.1.2. Having therefore examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the report(s) 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:

- Wastewater Treatment Design and compliance with the EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (EPA CoP)
- Impacts to adjacent farm, dwelling and SAC from wastewater discharges.

7.2. Wastewater Treatment Design

7.2.1. There is an existing septic tank on the site which is stated to have the potential to overflow onto neighbouring property to the south. It is therefore proposed to upgrade and improve the waste water treatment system (WWTS) to cater to a population equivalent (P.E.) of 6 which I consider appropriate for the 4-bedroom dwelling. The proposed extension would not change the P.E. of the dwelling as the current dwelling is also a 4-bed unit.

7.2.2. A Site Characterisation Form (SCF) was received with the application which identifies sensitive features nearby such as the Clyard Kettle Holes SAC and the regionally important bedrock aquifer underlying the site. Grey gravelly, clay and sandy soil was found in the trial holes. The associated groundwater protection response was categorised as R2² which defines the potential suitability of the site for development of a WWTS as:

“Acceptable subject to normal good practice and the following additional condition:

1. There is a minimum thickness of 2 m unsaturated soil/subsoil beneath the invert of the percolation trench of a septic tank system

OR

2. A secondary treatment system as described in Chapters 8 and 9 is installed, with a minimum thickness of 0.3 m unsaturated soil/subsoil with

percolation values from 3 to 75 (in addition to the polishing filter, which should be a minimum depth of 0.9 m), beneath the invert of the polishing filter (i.e. 1.2 m in total for a soil polishing filter)."

- 7.2.3. Due to the proximity of the site to the SAC, a tertiary treatment system is proposed from the outset. This is clearly identified in the desk study section of the SCF.
- 7.2.4. Section 10 of the EPA CoP outlines how tertiary systems provide additional treatment of waste water from secondary treatment systems and can include soil polishing filters or tertiary treatment systems. The latter option is proposed in this case as the site failed the subsurface soak test.
- 7.2.5. The site is an irregular shape however there is a large area of private open space situated to the west of the dwelling, between the dwelling, public road and an agricultural laneway. The trial holes were excavated in this location and Section 3 of the SCF notes the results of the 'T' subsurface test. No water table or bedrock was noted in the trial hole however soil compaction was evident in the upper 0.8m of subsoil. It is stated that topsoil in this location was removed and the area used to store large silage bales for an unspecified previous time period.
- 7.2.6. Appendix D of the EPA CoP provides guidance to carry out percolation tests. It outlines three possible scenarios following pre-soaking of the trial holes and scenario no.1 states:

"If the initial drop from 400 mm to 300 mm is greater than eight hours this means the percolation value will be greater than 120. There is no requirement to complete the test and the trial hole location is not suitable for discharge to ground at the level of that percolation test, as stated in Section 6.3 of I.S. CEN/TR 12566-2:2005"

- 7.2.7. The SCF states that the infiltration tests failed and are outside of the EPA prescribed limits due to compaction of the soil as the water levels in the trial holes fell between 80-150mm over 300 minutes (five hours). The SCF does not fully indicate how long it took for the water levels to drop to 300mm in two out of the three trial holes however extrapolating the data which is provided appears to indicate that the total time would not have exceeded eight hours and the assessment could have proceeded to step 5 of the SCF, the 'modified method'.

7.2.8. In this regard it is not clear why the SCF states that the tests failed. No surface 'P' testing was carried out due to the lack of topsoil. The SCF noted the presence of an existing dwelling on the site however and carried out further testing to inform design requirements for a gravel pad to cater for the hydraulic loading.

7.2.9. The CoP allows for derogations from prescribed limits in circumstances where there is an existing dwelling and treatment system on the site. Extracts of these derogations are outlined previously in the policy section of this report however I specifically highlight section 2.2 again as follows:

If retrofitting existing systems that do not comply with this CoP, where the site is unsuitable, the proposed upgrade must provide improved treatment and reduced environmental impact

7.2.10. The existing system is a septic tank system which provides primary treatment only. No references are made to the presence of an existing percolation area in any of the documentation received.

7.2.11. It is proposed to provide a certified packaged tertiary WWTS on the site in order to provide a higher quality discharge to ground. The packaged unit would be situated to the rear of the site while a new gravel bed distribution layer with a drip dispersal system would be installed to the west in the area where the trial holes were excavated. This system would be below the existing ground level and below the adjacent ground level. All minimum separation distances as set out in Table 6.2 of the EPA CoP would be exceeded.

7.2.12. I therefore acknowledge that the percolation tests failed to comply with the recommendations of the EPA CoP, however I agree with both the Planning Authority and the applicant's conclusions that improving the existing system is acceptable. I consider the proposed tertiary treatment system as outlined in the Site Characterisation Form would be an appropriate upgrade to the existing septic tank and this proposal would ultimately comply with the CoP as there would be improved treatment and reduced environmental impact.

7.2.13. Having regard to the potential to renovate the dwelling and restore it to a 4-bed unit without any requirement for planning permission, there is a high risk that discharges from the existing septic tank could negatively impact the surrounding environment and property due to the age and condition of the tank and lack of percolation. I

consider that the proposal to improve the treatment is an appropriate proposal and one which would significantly improve the quality of wastewater discharges even in the event the dwelling were not extended.

7.3. Potential Impacts

- 7.3.1. The appeal outlines concerns regarding potential impacts to the adjacent farm, dwelling and road as well as the nearby Clyard Kettle Holes Special Area of Conservation. Impacts to the SAC are discussed below under the heading of AA Screening however in summary, I consider the proposed works are likely to result in a neutral to positive impact and would not affect the integrity of the SAC.
- 7.3.2. All required minimum separation distances are met including separation from a dwelling, road, adjacent WWTS and karst features. In this regard I consider the size of the site to be appropriate and that the proposed layout is acceptable.
- 7.3.3. The appeal questions how topography was accounted for and suggests that wastewater would enter the public road and then agricultural land opposite the site. The applicants response however clarifies that the invert level to the gravel bed would be 1.1m below the level of the adjacent road and therefore treated wastewater would not be likely to enter the public road or any adjacent property.
- 7.3.4. Having regard to the proposed tertiary treatment which would likely lead to a much-improved quality of wastewater discharge from the site, I consider there is little to no likelihood of any negative impact occurring to any property outside of the site as a result of the proposed WWTS.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Clyard Kettle Holes SAC (000480) in view of the conservation objectives of this sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

8.2. This determination is based on:

- The small scale and domestic nature of works
- The proposal to upgrade wastewater treatment at the site, and
- The location of the site over 300m from the SAC and the lack of groundwater connectivity.

9.0 Recommendation

I recommend that planning permission is granted, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location and character of the site and surrounding area in a rural area together with the provisions of the Mayo County Development Plan 2022-2028 including Objectives RHO 10 and INO 8, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the scale and nature of the development is acceptable as it complies with local design guidance and would improve the quality of wastewater treatment on the site. The development is, therefore, in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 06 th day of January 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with
----	---

	<p>the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The existing dwelling and the proposed extension shall be jointly occupied as a single residential unit and the extension shall not be used, sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed, save as part of the dwelling.</p> <p>Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity.</p>
3.	<p>(a) The septic tank/wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application on 31st July 2024 and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent \leq 10) ” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(b) Treated effluent from the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area/ polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent \leq 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(c) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.</p>

	Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution
4.	<p>(a) All surface water generated within the site boundaries shall be collected and disposed of within the curtilage of the site. No surface water from roofs, paved areas or otherwise shall discharge onto the public road or adjoining properties.</p> <p>(b) The access driveway to the proposed development shall be provided with adequately sized pipes or ducts to ensure that no interference will be caused to existing roadside drainage.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent flooding or pollution.</p>
5.	<p>The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.</p> <p>Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.</p>

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Sarah O'Mahony
Planning Inspector

28th May 2025

Appendix 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	321926-25
Proposed Development Summary	Refurbish and extend existing derelict including installation of new wastewater treatment system.
Development Address	Coolisduff, Kilmaine, Co. Mayo
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2,	

<p>Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
--	--

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)

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix 2

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project		Renovate and extend dwelling, upgrade WWTS and alter vehicular entrance.		
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms		<p>The existing dwelling will increase by 92m² however the existing site boundaries will remain in place with the addition of one new boundary to the west where there is currently no physical boundary in place. No additional land take is proposed.</p> <p>The existing public water mains connection will remain in place and continue to be utilized.</p> <p>A three to six month construction phase is proposed with standard minor domestic scale emissions.</p> <p>There are no watercourses or surface water features on or adjacent to the site and no groundwater was noted in the percolation trial holes.</p> <p>The Clyard Kettle Holes Special Area of Conservation comprises four fragmented turloughs which are situated 320m to the southwest and 420m southeast at their closest points to the site.</p>		
Screening report		Y		
Natura Impact Statement		N		
Relevant submissions		One third party submission and appeal raises potential impacts to the nearby SAC.		
<p>The Planning Authority sought the preparation of an Appropriate Assessment screening report via a further information request which screened out the likelihood of impacts to the SAC.</p>				
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
<p>The screening report listed all European Sites within 15km however I consider the Clyard Kettle Holes SAC is the only site with potential connectivity due to the distance between the subject site and all other European Sites.</p>				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹	Distance from proposed	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³

	Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	development (km)		Y/N
Clyard Kettle Holes SAC (000480)	<p>Turloughs [3180]</p> <p>Calcareous fens with Cladium mariscus and species of the Caricion davallianae [7210]</p> <p>Link to NPWS website and Conservation Objectives: CO000480.pdf</p>	320m to the southwest and 420m southeast	Potential groundwater connection.	Y

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

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*	
	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: Clyard Kettle Holes SAC (000480)	<p>Direct: None.</p> <p>Indirect: Negative impacts (temporary) on surface water/water quality due to construction related emissions including increased sedimentation and construction related pollution and permanent due to an on-site wastewater treatment system.</p>	Negative effect on habitat quality/ function and undermine conservation objectives related to water and soil quality including nutrient status.
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No	
	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site* No	

The proposed dwelling extension is minor in scale and does not comprise any land take. The construction period and nature associated with the domestic scale works is highly unlikely to generate any dust, noise or water discharges of a scale to potentially impact the SAC.

The proposed new wastewater treatment system will improve wastewater discharges from the site which is a positive impact but not likely to be significant due to the operational scale of the 6P.E. dwelling, the distance to the SAC and the lack of any bedrock or high water table noted in the trial holes. There are no karst features situated in close proximity to the site and there

is no known groundwater connectivity due to the lack of karst features or tracer lines within 300m of the site.

Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Clyard Kettle Holes SAC (000480). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.

No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Clyard Kettle Holes SAC (000480) in view of the conservation objectives of this sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The small scale and domestic nature of works,
- The proposal to upgrade wastewater treatment at the site, and
- The location of the site over 300m from the SAC.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____