



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-322464-25

Development	Retention of; alterations and extensions to existing dwelling, detached home office, detached garage, waste water treatment system and associated site works.
Location	East House, Long Island, Schull, County Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	25/66
Applicant	Albert Manifold
Type of Application	Retention Permission / Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Notification of Grant
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant	Daniel Cronin
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	6 th August 2025
Inspector	Gary Farrelly

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site has a stated area of 0.6 hectares and is located on the island of Long Island, County Cork. Long Island is located approximately 800 metres south of Colla Pier, Schull. Access to the island is via boat. The subject site is located on the eastern side of the island and is accessed via a single carriage laneway.
- 1.2. The majority of the island is located within the Roaringwater Bay and Islands Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code 000101). A section of the subject site incorporating the dwelling and detached home office structure is located outside this designated area.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Retention permission is sought for the following works:
 - The renovation, alterations and extensions to the existing dwellinghouse. These include alterations to the roof pitch, installation of a dormer window on the front elevation, alteration to an existing dormer window, installation of skylights and new window openings. The extensions include a porch of 3.5sqm on the north elevation and a lean-to-roof single storey extension of 37sqm on the south elevation. The overall internal floor area of the dwelling measures 94.5sqm.
 - The retention of a detached home office to the side of the dwelling (*constructed in the location of a previously granted art studio, workshop and utility area*). This has a floor area of 27.5sqm, is built to a ridge height of 4.17 metres and is externally comprised of natural stone and glazing. The internal layout includes a bathroom.
 - The retention of a detached garage for use as a domestic store and boat house. This has a floor area of 93sqm and built to a ridge height of 4.55 metres. The external finish of the structure is still to be completed and will comprise of stonework.
 - The retention of a wastewater treatment system. A report accompanies the application stating that the current system installed replaced a block built

deteriorated septic tank and restricted soakaway and now complies with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) code of practices with sufficient capacity to cater for the 1-bedroom dwelling. The work still to be completed involves the installation of AJ/distribution covers at the distribution box of the percolation area.

- The retention of the extension of the existing curtilage of the property. This now includes the percolation area located to the south of the septic tank.

2.2. Permission is also sought for the closing up of the existing vehicular entrance at the 'private road' and the making good of said boundary. The application has been accompanied by an Appropriate Assessment Screening report entitled 'Information to inform Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment'.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The planning authority (PA) decided to grant permission, subject to 9 no. conditions, by Order dated 15th April 2025.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

Planning Reports

The area planner (AP) report on file assessed the development in terms of, inter alia, its visual impact on the high value landscape area, the planning history and historic developments within the site. The AP noted the internal reports from the Ecologist and Area Engineer and recommended a grant of permission subject to conditions.

Other Technical Reports

Ecologist (*report dated 10/04/25*) – The ecologist report outlined no objection to a grant of permission on ecological grounds. The report considered that due to the minor nature and scale of the development on previously disturbed and modified ground and to the location of the percolation area within low value amenity grassland which does not correspond to the European dry heath qualifying habitat, potential significant

effects can be excluded. The ecologist was satisfied that an Appropriate Assessment was not required.

Area Engineer (*report dated 10/03/25*) – This report outlined no objection to a grant of permission subject to conditions. It considered the existing wastewater treatment system acceptable subject to the proposed adjustments.

Conditions

- Condition no. 3 restricted the use of the detached home office and garage/boat house to the enjoyment of the main dwelling onsite, prohibited its use for any other purpose such as holiday/residential letting and required it to be retained in the same ownership of the dwellinghouse.
- Condition no. 4 required revised planting proposals along the western boundary of the site comprising native species.
- Condition nos. 8 and 9 required the completion of the wastewater treatment system in accordance with the details submitted with the application and the entering into a desludging and maintenance servicing agreement.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

3.4. Third Party Observations

A single third party submission was submitted to the PA which raised concerns with the development in terms of, inter alia, the extent of works to the dwelling, visual amenity, compliance with enforcement notices and the construction methodology used on site.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

(a) Subject site

PA ref. 98/122

Permission was granted for renovations and extension to a stone ruin for use as an art studio, workshop and utility area.

(b) Lands c. 125 metres to the east of subject site

An Coimisiún Pleanála (ACP) ref. 317413 – Section 5 first party Referral (Albert Manifold)

ACP considered the construction of two agricultural sheds development that was not exempted development. This referral decision is currently subject to judicial review [2024/825 JR].

ACP ref. 317408 – Section 5 first party Referral (Albert Manifold)

ACP considered the erection of replacement fencing to enclose the site development that was not exempted development. This referral decision is currently subject to judicial review [2024/824 JR].

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028

Volume 1 Written Statement

Objective MCI 7-8 Supporting the Islands

Support the inhabited islands in County Cork and to recognise the special planning and development needs of islands and island communities, particularly access, infrastructure and services.

Objective MCI 7-10 Development Proposals on the Islands

(b) Prioritise development that contributes to retention of the year-round population on the islands, that has a clear and identifiable economic and social benefit (that endures beyond the construction phase), and that is compatible with the capacity of the local community to accommodate it.

(d) Ensure that new development of any kind is sympathetic to the individual form and character of the islands' landscapes and traditional building patterns.

Objective GI 14-9: Landscape

a) Protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork's built and natural environment.

GI 14-10: Draft Landscape Strategy

Ensure that the management of development throughout the County will have regard for the value of the landscape, its character, distinctiveness and sensitivity as recognised in the Cork County Draft Landscape Strategy and its recommendations, in order to minimize the visual and environmental impact of development, particularly in areas designated as High Value Landscapes where higher development standards (layout, design, landscaping, materials used) will be required.

Objective GI 14-12: General Views and Prospects

Preserve the character of all important views and prospects, particularly sea views, river or lake views, views of unspoilt mountains, upland or coastal landscapes, views of historical or cultural significance (including buildings and townscapes) and views of natural beauty as recognized in the Draft Landscape Strategy.

Objective GI 14-13 Scenic Routes

Protect the character of those views and prospects obtainable from scenic routes and in particular stretches of scenic routes that have very special views and prospects identified in this Plan.

Objective HE 16-19 Vernacular Heritage

a) Protect, maintain and enhance the established character, forms, features and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements and the contribution they make to our architectural, archaeological, historical, social and cultural heritage and to local character and sense of place.

c) There will generally be a presumption in favour of the retention of vernacular buildings and encouragement of the retention and re-use of vernacular buildings subject to normal planning considerations, while ensuring that the re-use is compatible with environmental and heritage protection.

Volume 5 West Cork - Section 2.27 Long Island

Objective GDO-01

Long Island lies within Roaring Water Bay and Islands Special Area of Conservation and within the Roaringwater Bay and Islands proposed Natural Heritage Area. Development on the island should be compatible with the protection of these sites.

Objective GDO-02

Conserve the landscape and cultural quality of Long Island while recognising the needs of its occupants and improving service provision to the island. All development should be carefully designed, sited and landscaped to retain the character of the island, and avoid harm to the environmental qualities of the locality.

Cork Rural Design Guide (July 2010)¹

- Part 3 – Appropriate house design

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is located within the Roaringwater Bay and Islands Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (Site Code 000101). This is also designated as a proposed Natural Heritage Area (pNHA).

5.3. Environmental Impact Assessment (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. No mandatory requirement for EIA therefore arises and there is also no requirement for a screening determination. I refer the Commission to Appendix 1 of the report in this regard.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal was lodged to the Commission on 7th May 2025 by Daniel Cronin. The grounds of appeal are summarised as follows:

- There is not one original feature left on the house. It was demolition by bad design and if a normal planning application was received for this designated

¹ <http://corkcocoplans.ie/wp-content/uploads/bsk-pdf-manager/2016/07/Rural-Design-Guide-2nd-Edition-2010.pdf> (Accessed 19th August 2025)

high level landscape, it would have been turned down by the Council. The house has been flipped from front to back by adding the entrance porch.

- There is concern that this will set a precedent for development on the island. Long island is the last island that has its traditional houses in place which have all maintained more or less their front elevations. These houses were architecturally designed to fit into the landscape. The development should not have been allowed for the reason of our island heritage.
- There are a lot of dimensional errors on the submitted drawings. The discrepancies relate to the original window and dormer positions, original eaves level, the raising of the wall plate by 0.8mm, and the original roof pitch. It is also stated by the appellant to allow for discrepancies of his own.
- The preparation of the ecology report should have been done before construction and not after. Questions are raised regarding the location of a number of photographs (referenced as plates within the ecology report). It is considered that plate 5 is not at the location of the garage due to fencing on the ditch and plate 6 was taken south of the house, whilst the garage is located north along the ditch. Locating previous positions of demolished sheds and greenhouses is not within the remit of the ecologist. The garage could not have been finished without the use of heavy machinery and the report uses hearsay on construction methodology. The garage site was destroyed without planning permission.
- There are a number of concerns with the attached conditions. There is no mention of why a garage in the SAC is considered ok and questions are raised regarding the need for a bathroom within the office building. There are no private roads on Long Island and the road outside the property was always public. A condition to restrict use of the home office is considered confusing.
- The condition requiring sight distances in the interest of road safety if the road is private is questioned.
- The wording of the site notice is confusing and misleading and not detailed enough.

6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant issued a response to the grounds of appeal on 25th June 2025 which is summarised as follows:

- The statement that the house was demolished is inaccurate and unsubstantiated. The roof was removed due to severe rot in the original roof timbers which had rendered it structurally unsound. During removal of the roof the central chimney collapsed. The gable walls and north elevation wall have been preserved. Photographs are provided showing the house with the roof removed.
- The assertion regarding dimensional errors on the drawings are unfounded. The dimensions of the current dwelling were surveyed and displayed through detailed drawings. The walls of the structure were risen by 4 courses of standard blocks which is equal to 400mm. The existing wall plate level is shown in green and current wall plate level in black on drawing no. 005. There is no evidence provided indicating that the original eaves level was at 3150mm. The PA did not raise any concerns with the accuracy of the drawings after it conducted a site inspection.
- The alteration to the roof pitch was minimal but was a necessary consequence of raising the wall plate. The character of a roof is defined by its profile and pitch and the reinstatement of a well-designed pitched roof preserves the character. The marginal change in angle does not materially affect the overall appearance when compared with the original structure.
- The appellant's claim that houses on the island were uniquely designed with a 45° roof pitch to reflect the landscape is not grounded in any relevant policy or guidance. The Cork Rural Design Guide recommends a typical roof pitch of between 35° to 55° allowing for variation and flexibility within the vernacular tradition.
- The dwelling is not a protected structure nor situated within an architectural conservation area and the development has not contravened any heritage protections.

- Prior to the works the environment already contained built elements and the detached garage has been sited in close proximity to the existing structures to provide a clustered grouping. The detached garage and home office are sheltered to the north by a natural sod and stone embankment along with substantial vegetation. There is no material adverse effect on the landscape character or the high value landscape area designation. The additions to the dwelling are modest. Whilst the property is visible from the sea, the dwelling has always been part of the coastal vista.
- The principal elevation of the house is on the road facing elevation and not the elevation of the extension. This was partially shown on drawings submitted as part of application ref. W/98/1922.
- The previous owners operated a small business and used social media to showcase their property. A video link is provided showing evidence of the site being significantly modified and not untouched or a natural part of the island. Such information does fall under the remit of the ecologist in establishing the baseline condition.
- There are c. 22 houses on the island. 15 of these houses have not remained unchanged and have undergone substantial renovations over time resulting in varied roof styles, altered elevations and numerous extensions that have substantially altered their original appearance. A number of photographs are provided showing same.
- The qualifying interests of the SAC are not present within the site, as confirmed by the Screening Report. The site was previously disturbed, cleared of all vegetation and ploughed for farming by the previous owners. No scientific evidence has been provided by the appellant to substantiate his claims.
- The inclusion of a home office with a bathroom is common and is a standard feature.
- The works were carried out by a reputable developer in full compliance with all applicable industry standards and guidelines with due consideration given to the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) best practice documents. A letter from the developer is provided confirming same.

- The access road to the north of the site is not a public roadway.
- No asbestos was found on site during the works. This is confirmed by a statement from the developer.
- A statement from the applicant is provided outlining his links to the island, the reasoning for the renovation and his willingness to enter into a Section 47 agreement with regards to occupation. *(However, the Commission should note that the development relates to works to an existing established dwelling).*
- There is no intensification of use of wastewater discharge and the house remains a one-bedroom dwelling.
- The public notices were prepared in accordance with relevant regulations and were deemed valid by the PA.

6.3. **Planning Authority Response**

The PA did not issue a response to the grounds of appeal.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Design
- Visual Amenity

Design

7.2. I note the concerns of the appellant regarding the extent of works to the original dwelling, the size of the window openings and the loss of original features. I also note the response from the applicant confirming the reasoning for the removal of the roof and chimney and details of the alterations to the roof pitch and eaves height.

7.3. The Commission should note that the building in question is not listed within the record of protected structures nor is it included in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH) survey. The site or island is not located within an Architectural Conservation Area (ACA). Notwithstanding this, I consider the original structure to be of vernacular status, which is not disputed by any party, and therefore, there is still a requirement to protect and maintain vernacular heritage in accordance with Objective HE 16-19 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP).

7.4. The works to the dwelling included a 37sqm extension to the south elevation and a 3.5sqm porch extension on the north elevation. Whilst I note that the appellant questions the orientation of the original front and rear elevations, having regard to the information outlined within Section 2.3 of the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal, I am satisfied that the orientation of the elevations is accurate. The remaining works to the dwelling involved alterations to the roof pitch, the widening of existing windows, new window openings, the increase in size of an existing dormer, new dormer and new skylights.

7.5. I have had regard to the Cork Rural Design Guide (July 2010) and in particular 'Part 3 – Appropriate House Design' of same. I consider that the extension to the rear (comprising 37sqm) and front porch (3sqm) to be minor in scale and height and which

still respects the character of the dwelling form of the dormer type property. I consider the alterations to the eaves level and roof pitch to be minor with the eaves level still remaining at a low scale. I note that the ridge height of the property has not been increased. The angle of the new roof pitch is still in accordance with the recommendations within the Rural Design Guide (i.e. 35-55°). I note that the vertical emphasis on both gables remain.

- 7.6. I consider that whilst the enlargement of the window openings, new windows and lean to type glazed extension have altered the property to a more contemporary design, I do not consider that such changes have been seriously detrimental to the character of the original vernacular dwelling. Furthermore, whilst I note that the central chimney no longer remains, which I considered represented a distinctive feature of the original dwelling, I acknowledge the applicant's explanation and recognise the building energy rating requirements for the property.
- 7.7. Whilst the appellant does not specifically raise any design issues regarding the detached home office and garage, the Commission should note that I have no significant concerns regarding the design of these structures having regard to the modest height and external finishes of both structures. I note that there are no development management standards within the CDP that limits the floor area of such detached buildings and, therefore, I am satisfied that the design and scale of both structures to be acceptable. If the Commission are minded to grant permission, I recommend that a standard condition is attached that restricts the use of these structures to that of non-habitable use incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse.

Conclusion

- 7.8. Overall, I consider that the renovations and extensions to the dwelling have not been seriously detrimental to the established vernacular character and form of the property. Additionally, I consider that the works to the dwelling will contribute to the retention of a year round population on the island which is supported by objective MCI 7-10 (Development Proposals on the Islands) and Objective MCI 7-8 (Supporting the Islands) of the CDP. Furthermore, the I consider the retention and reuse of the property to be in accordance with Objective HE 16-19(c) (Vernacular Heritage) of the CDP.

Visual Amenity

- 7.9. The appellant has also raised concern with the impact of the development on the island landscape. I note that the subject site is located within an area designated as High Value Landscape (HVL) as per the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 (CDP). Having inspected the site, I consider that the site and island are located within a sensitive environment with extensive views from the surrounding landscape and sea. The site is also visible from a scenic route on the mainland east of Colla Pier (Ref. S100 Road between Schull and Colla).
- 7.10. The Commission should note that there have been historic structures within the locations of the existing house and detached home office for a substantial period of time. I have reviewed the 1995 aerial maps from the National Monuments Service Historic Environment Viewer² which illustrates same. Having regard to the site not representing an unspoilt landscape, to the minor scale of the works to the dwelling (as I have concluded above), and to the modest scale and height of the home office structure, I do not consider that works to these structures have adversely affected the surrounding landscape or significantly impacted on sea views or views from the scenic route S100.
- 7.11. Whilst the detached garage represents the introduction of a new structure to the coastal landscape, having regard to its modest height, scale and proposed external stone finish, I do not consider that it will result in a significant impact on the coastal landscape or important views.

Conclusion

- 7.12. I consider that the overall development which provides a linear type cluster of buildings on previously developed and disturbed land is sympathetic to the character of the landscape and pattern of development on the island in accordance with objective MCI 7-10(d) and Objective GDO-02 (Volume 5 West Cork). The character of views from the sea, coast and scenic route S100 will be maintained in accordance with Objective GI 14-9(a) (Landscape), Objective GI 14-12 (General Views and Prospects) and Objective GI 14-13 (Scenic Routes).

²

<https://heritagedata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=0c9eb9575b544081b0d296436d8f60f8> (Accessed 19th August 2025)

Other Issues

Discrepancies on drawings

- 7.13. The Commission should note that the appellant has stated that there are a number of discrepancies on the submitted drawings such as inaccurate positions of the original window and dormer, original eaves level and roof pitch. I note the response from the applicant stating that these claims are unfounded and the drawings produced were from the result of a survey of the house.
- 7.14. It should also be noted that the appellant requests for an allowance for discrepancies in his measurements. Having regard to the information on file, including the photographs provided of the original dwelling and to the fact that the PA validated the application and raised no validation issues after the completion of a site inspection, I am satisfied with the accuracy of the submitted drawings.

Status of access road

- 7.15. I note the appellant's comment that the access road to the subject site is not private. I note the applicant's response. The Commission should note that I have reviewed the Local Road Network GIS mapping tool³ which illustrates the road from Long Island pier to a cluster of properties approximately 500 metres west of the site as being a local tertiary public road (L-44077). However, the public designation ends at this point and does not extend to the subject site. Therefore, I am satisfied that the information provided by the applicant is accurate in this regard.

Public Notices

- 7.16. The appellant also raised concerns with the wording of the public notices. I note that the PA considered them acceptable and validated the application. The Commission should note that I consider the wording of the notices to comply with the requirements of Article 18(1) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended.

3

<https://roadmanagement.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?useExisting=1&layers=815bdcf61c3d4e91929179438cf05b9a> (Accessed 19th August 2025)

8.0 Appropriate Assessment (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 the Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC (000101) or Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA (004156), or any other European site, in view of the Conservation Objectives of those sites. Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required. I refer the Commission to Appendix 2 of my report in this regard.

8.2. This determination is based on the following:

- The location of the works to the dwelling and detached home office outside the designated boundary of the SAC (000101), and to the minor nature and scale of said works.
- The location of the construction works to the detached garage on previously disturbed lands (as shown by aerial maps from 1995, 2011-2013 and 2013-2018 from the National Monuments Service Historic Environment Viewer) with no evidence of the qualifying interest European dry heaths [4030] near the development site (as noted within the submitted screening report and my observations on the date of the site inspection).
- The absence of any hydrological link to the coastal waterbody and associated qualifying interests within same.
- The septic tank and percolation area being constructed in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Code of Practice (as confirmed by the submitted report entitled 'Assessment of Sewerage Waste Water System').
- The level of dilution available within the coastal waterbody.
- The scientific information provided in the Screening report regarding the impact of the garage development.
- The screening determination of the ecologist of the PA.

8.3. No mitigation measures aimed at avoiding or reducing impacts on European sites were required to be considered in reaching this determination.

9.0 Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening

- 9.1. No water deterioration concerns were raised by the planning authority or submissions. I have assessed the project and have considered the objectives set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface and ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration.
- 9.2. The subject site is located within the Bandon Islands groundwater catchment (Code IE_SW_G_013) which is of good status and not at risk of not achieving its WFD objective.⁴ The coastal waterbody nearest to the site is the Roaring Water Bay (Code IE_SW_140_0000) which is also not at risk of not achieving its WFD objective. Whilst the ecological status is classed as good, the chemical surface water status is failing to achieve good status.⁵ I note that there are no surface water bodies within the site.
- 9.3. 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 surface and/or groundwater waterbodies either qualitatively or quantitatively. The reason for this conclusion is due to the minor scale and nature of the works, to the septic tank and percolation area being constructed in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Code of Practice (as confirmed by the submitted report entitled 'Assessment of Sewerage Waste Water System'), to the distance to the coastal waterbody and level of dilution available within said waterbody.
- 9.4. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any waterbody (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any waterbody in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

My recommendation to the Commission is that permission should be **Granted**, subject to conditions, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

⁴ https://www.catchments.ie/data/#/waterbody/IE_SW_G_013?_k=hiifwt

⁵ https://www.catchments.ie/data/#/waterbody/IE_SW_140_0000?_k=v8gzfd (Accessed 19th August 2025)

- Having reviewed the Cork County Council Development Contribution Scheme (2004), I note that the first 60sqm of extensions to private dwellings receive a 100% reduction in contributions. Additionally, detached domestic buildings are not included in said scheme. Therefore, the Commission should note that the development is not subject to a development contribution condition.
- The Commission should also note that the PA's ecology officer had concerns with the planting of Escallonia along the western boundary of the site due to its non-native origins and therefore recommended this to be omitted by way of condition. This is reflected in condition no. 6 below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the location of the site within a high value landscape area, as designated under the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, to the location of the development to be retained and proposed development on previously developed and disturbed land, to the nature and minor scale of the works comprising of alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling, to the design and scale of the detached structures, it is considered that the development, subject to conditions, would not seriously injure the character of the existing dwelling and would not seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, including on views from the sea, coast and scenic route (ref. S100). It is, therefore, considered that the development to be retained and proposed development would be in accordance with Objectives GI 14-9(a) (Landscape), GI 14-12 (General Views and Prospects), GI 14-13 (Scenic Routes) and HE 16-19 (Vernacular Heritage) of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. The development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on the 20th day of February 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 and the development shall be retained, carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The detached home office building and detached garage building shall be used solely for use incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, as specified in the lodged documentation, and shall not be used for human habitation or be sold, rented or leased independently of the house and shall not be used for the carrying out of any trade of business.

Reason: In the interest of orderly development.

3. The external finishes of the detached garage shall be completed in natural stone.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to ensure an appropriate high standard of development.

4. The existing dwelling and the extensions to be retained 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.

Reason: To restrict the use of the extension in the interest of residential amenity

5. The septic tank system shall be completed in accordance with the details contained within the submitted report entitled 'Assessment of Sewerage Waste Water System' received by the planning authority on the 20th day of February, 2025. The developer shall enter into a service agreement with a suitably qualified contractor for ongoing desludging and maintenance of the septic tank system.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

6. A revised planting schedule for the site shall be submitted to the planning authority for its written approval within 3 months of the date of this order. The revised schedule shall omit Escallonia and any proposed planting shall comprise of native tree and shrub species only.

Reason: In the interest of biodiversity.

Declaration

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.

Gary Farrelly
Planning Inspector

19th August 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	322464-25			
Proposed Development Summary	Modifications and extensions to an existing dwelling, construction of detached home office and garage			
Development Address	East House, Long Island, Schull, County Cork			
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)			Yes	X
			No	No further action required
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		Proceed to Q.3	
No	X		No further action required	
3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?				
Yes				EIA Mandatory EIAR required
No				Proceed to Q.4
4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?				
Yes				Preliminary examination required (Form 2)
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?				
No		Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q4)		
Yes		Screening Determination required		

Appendix 2

AA Screening Determination

Screening for Appropriate Assessment	
Test for likely significant effects	
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics	
<i>Brief description of project</i>	The project involves the retention of a renovation and extension of an existing dwelling, the retention of a detached home office building, the retention of a detached garage and retention of a wastewater treatment system.
<i>Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms</i>	The island of Long Island is located within the Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC (Site Code 000101) with pockets of areas of existing properties across the island excluded from the designated area. The subject dwelling and detached home office represents one of these excluded areas. However, the location of the detached garage and the percolation area are within the SAC designation. European dry heath (EDH), which is a qualifying interest of the SAC, is located throughout the eastern side of the island, which I observed on the date of my site inspection. There are no surface water features within the site. The topography of the site slopes down towards the coast.
<i>Screening report</i>	A screening report entitled 'Information to Inform Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment' was prepared and submitted with the application. Whilst the screening report refers to a Section 5 declaration, this appears to be in error. It is stated that a site survey was undertaken on 31 st July 2024. A desktop species survey was undertaken and noted records of harbour porpoise and otter within 2km of the site.

	The screening report concludes that “the development in the east of Long Island” either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, has not resulted in any significant effects on European sites. However, it should be noted that the screening report assesses the garage development only (Section 2.4 of report).
<i>Natura Impact Statement (NIS)</i>	None
<i>Relevant submissions</i>	The appellant questions the acceptability of a garage in an SAC and has raised concerns regarding the condition of the site prior to the construction of the detached garage.

Step 2: Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-Pathway-Receptor model

Having reviewed the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) designations viewer map and the Environmental Protection Agency’s AA Mapping Tool, I have identified two European sites that are potentially within a zone of influence of the proposed development. These are outlined within Table 1 below.

Table 1

European Site (Code)	Qualifying Interests (QIs)	Distance from proposed development	Ecological connections	Consider further in Screening (Y/N)
Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC (000101)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large shallow inlets and bays [1160] • Reefs [1170] • Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230] • European dry heaths [4030] • Submerged or partially submerged sea caves [8330] 	Development is within the designated site	Yes	Yes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phocoena Phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351] • Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355] • Halichoerus grypus (Grey Seal) [1364] 			
Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA (004156)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peregrine (Falco peregrinus) [A103] • Chough (Pyrrhocorax) [A346] 	Approximately 11km southeast/west of the subject site.	Distance pathway is significantly remote*	No

*Site specific conservation objectives have been set for the Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA (21 March 2025). For the Peregrine, the NPWS conservation objectives supporting document outlines occupied territories and suitable nesting habitat range from 2.1km-9km with foraging prey usually caught within 2km of an eyrie, rarely beyond 6km. For Chough, the NPWS supporting document outlines that they usually forage along the coast and roost close to good foraging habitat. The desktop study within the Screening report outlines no records of such species within 2km of the site. Having regard to the distance of the site to the designated SPA, no significant ex-situ effects were/are considered likely.

Step 3: Describe the likely significant effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European sites

Having regard to the location of the development and to the presence of European dry heath [4030] on the eastern end of Long Island, I consider that there is potential for habitat loss, disturbance or fragmentation as a result of the development.

Having regard to the nature of the development to be retained and proposed development and having regard to the NPWS' Article 17 Habitats Assessment, I consider that there was/is no possibility of significant effects on large shallow inlets and bays [1160], reefs [1170], vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230] or submerged or partially submerged sea caves [8330].

Site name Qualifying Interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site	
	Impacts	Effects
<p>Roaringwater Bay and Islands SAC (000101)</p> <p>Large shallow inlets and bays [1160]</p> <p>Reefs [1170]</p> <p>Vegetated sea cliffs of the Atlantic and Baltic coasts [1230]</p> <p>European dry heaths [4030]</p> <p>Submerged or partially submerged sea caves [8330]</p> <p>Phocoena Phocoena (Harbour Porpoise) [1351]</p> <p>Lutra lutra (Otter) [1355]</p> <p>Halichoerus grypus (Grey Seal) [1364]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential disturbance on QI species during construction works • Release of silt and sediment into adjacent watercourses • Habitat loss, disturbance and fragmentation of EDH [4030] • Introduction of invasive species 	<p><u>Disturbance</u></p> <p>Having regard to the minor scale and nature of the construction works and the extent of the remaining works to be completed, to the absence of any supporting habitat for the QI species [1351], [1355] and [1364] within the site and to the distance to the coastal waterbody, it is considered that the completed works would not have likely caused a significant disturbance to QI species and the remaining works to be completed are unlikely to cause same.</p> <p><u>Deterioration of Water Quality</u></p> <p>There are no watercourses within the site that provide a hydrological link to the coastal waterbody. The topography of the lands slope down towards the coast, however, having regard to the distance to the coast and intervening lands, and to the level of dilution</p>

		<p>available within the waterbody, it is considered that the works would not have likely caused a deterioration in water quality and the remaining works are unlikely to cause same.</p> <p><u>Habitat Loss, Disturbance and Fragmentation</u></p> <p>The screening report concluded that there was no EDH within the site and therefore, there was no risk of loss or fragmentation of this habitat. I noted no EDH within the immediate locality of the development on the date of the site inspection. I also noted that the area in question was previously disturbed and modified, as accepted by the PA'S ecologist. The works to the percolation area of the septic tank have been undertaken in an area of amenity grassland which is not qualifying habitat. Therefore, it is considered that the works would not have likely resulted in habitat loss, disturbance or fragmentation of EDH and the remaining</p>
--	--	--

		<p>works are unlikely to cause same.</p> <p><u>Invasive Species</u></p> <p>There was no soil removed from the site and gravel/stone material was transported to the site from a local quarry. The screening report acknowledges that this has the potential to harbour non native invasive species, however, it would not be able to survive on sensitive habitat such as EDH. No non-native species were recorded during the site survey. Therefore, it is considered that the works would not have likely caused a significant effect and the remaining works are unlikely to cause same.</p>
	<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No</p>	
	<p>If No, is there a likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</p> <p>The site is located approximately 125 metres west of the site where the Commission considered that the development of agricultural sheds and replacement fencing would have likely resulted in a significant effect on the SAC and therefore required AA (Section 5 referrals refs. 317408 / 317413). This was primarily due to the</p>	

	<p>impact on EDH which occurred throughout the site of the development.</p> <p>Having regard to the separation distance of the subject site to the site of refs. 317408 / 317413, the absence of any hydrological link between the sites, and to the absence of EDH within the locality of the subject development, it is considered that there would have been no likelihood for a significant in-combination effect and with regards to the remaining works proposed there is no likelihood of same.</p>
<p>Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</p>	
<p>I conclude that the development (alone or in combination with other plans and projects) would not have likely resulted/likely to result in significant effects on European sites. No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to this determination.</p>	