



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Addendum Report

ABP-322464-25A

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 Introduction

- 1.1. This Addendum Report should be read in conjunction with the Inspector's report on file dated 19th August 2025.

2.0 Commission Direction

- 2.1. The Commission decided to defer consideration of this case (Commission Direction CD-020693-25) on 16th September 2025. A Section 132 notice (Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended) was issued to the applicant which stated the following:

In order to reach a fully informed and reasoned consideration of the 'Information to Inform the Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment' submitted by the applicant, the Commission requires the following additional details associated with the report to be submitted:

2.3 Ecology Survey Methodology

A figure/map identifying the location of all baseline survey transects, walkovers and/or sampling points in the vicinity of the various developments proposed and proposed for retention of planning permission.

2.4 Development Description

Detailed drawings (1:500) showing:

(i) The previous site layout (prior to the alterations for which retention of planning permission is being sought) including the red line boundary in the context of the SAC boundary to include the following:

(a) The location, extent and layout of all structures prior to alterations taking place for which planning permission and retention of planning permission is currently being sought.

(b) The extent of the area which was subject to previous cultivation practices in the vicinity of the structures which are the subject of a current application for permission and retention of permission.

(ii) The current site layout relative to the SAC boundary to include:

- (a) The location and extent of all existing structures on site including those proposed for retention and their associated works area.*

2.5.2 Habitats

Survey results verifying the locations of the nearest European Dry Heath (4030) within the Special Area of Conservation to the development for which permission and retention of planning permission is currently being sought.

3.3.1 Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

In the assessment of likely significant effects, please provide clarification of any differentiation to be drawn between previous habitat disturbance of a temporary nature (such as that associated with prior cultivation practices onsite) versus potential permanent habitat loss (arising from the provision of infill and hardstanding to accommodate permanent structures).

General

Clarification of mitigation measures, if any, that were, or are proposed to be implemented to ensure that works associated with the proposed development and the development for which retention permission is sought, did not historically and will not, as a result of the works that have been carried out, have an adverse effect on the integrity of any Special Area of Conservation.

3.0 Applicant's Submission

- 3.1. On 22nd October 2025, the applicant responded to the Section 132 request and submitted an updated Appropriate Assessment (AA) screening report, together with cover letters from the ecologist and planning consultant as well as updated drawings. A further ecological survey has been undertaken, and a full description of the survey methodology has been provided. It is stated that the updated screening report and ecological assessment have resulted in no changes arising from the original conclusion that the proposed development screens out for AA.
- 3.2. On 29th October 2025, the applicant's submission was circulated to other parties under Section 131 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.

4.0 Response from Parties

Response from third-party appellant

A response from the third-party appellant was received on 17th November 2025. The issues raised in the submission are summarised as follows:

- On submitted Map 003, it is a major exaggeration that the area marked as a cleared field is exactly that. Pathways were cleared as showing on submitted images 1-4, however, there was no indiscriminate flattening of the site. The submitted video was taken in February 2023 when everything had died which is the natural cycle.
- On submitted Map 001, at the site of the office, the position of the demolished stone chamber which was to become a tea room (W/98/1922) has not been indicated. The home office to be retained is not in the location of what was granted in W/98/1922. A site layout plan is provided marking it as located closer to the dwelling. The ecologist has put the shed and greenhouse on the garage site by pure speculation. The location of the vegetable patch and flower bed on the garage site is wrong as shown on plate number 5 (submitted by the appellant).
- Within the updated AA screening report, plate number 1 which shows the garage site, is not the garage site but is down by the shore. Plate number 5 showing the vegetable patch as the location of the garage/boathouse is different to the location of plate number 1. The location of the garage is against a stone and sod ditch whilst the vegetable patch is against a stone ditch with posts and fisherman's floats. On plate number 6 which shows the former shed and glasshouse, it is again stated that is the location of the garage/boathouse, however, on map 001 the shed is shown as south of the garage/boathouse and the glasshouse is not shown.
- On page 15 of the AA screening report it is stated that the construction took place on an area where previous structures such as a shed and glasshouse had existed in the past under the management of the previous owners and the area of the constructed garage/boathouse exceeded the historic shed/glasshouse by approximately 20sqm. These were already demolished

prior to the ecologist being onsite so it is questioned how this difference in sqm was calculated. The garage/boathouse measures 119sqm and not 92sqm as stated on page 15.

- It is stated that a three tonne digger and a JCB rubber tyre digger were used, however, there was never a JCB onsite. The methodology of the garage/boathouse construction is speculation and such construction would have required heavy machinery to transport materials.
- The preplanning consultation in October 2024 is null and void as the work was in full flow in October and the photographs provided to the planning authority as part of the application were from 21st March 2025. No photographs were provided as part of preplanning which would have shown machinery onsite.
- Further concerns are raised from the planner's report regarding the applicant's housing circumstances and the design and visual impact of the development.
- Concerns are raised regarding the structural integrity of the works to the dwelling, and it is contended that it is a dangerous structure. A number of photographs (14 no.) are provided showing cracks at a property in Westland. No drawings from a structural engineer were provided. Details of a letter to the Council dated 24th July 2024 is provided in which the appellant raises concerns with the construction methodology of the structural works.

4.1. Response from Planning Authority

The PA issued no response to the applicant's submission.

5.0 Addendum Assessment

- 5.1. Having regard to the terms of the Commission Direction CD-020693-25, the Commission should note that this assessment is restricted to the issue of Appropriate Assessment (AA) Screening and the submission relating to matters raised in the Direction. Whilst the third-party submission has raised further concerns regarding the design of the proposed development and impact on visual amenity, I am satisfied that these issues have been addressed within the Inspector's report dated 19th August 2025 (*herein referred to as "the Inspector's report"*).

- 5.2. The Commission should note that as part of the applicant's submission, a Section 5 declaration from the Planning Authority, issued on 11th August 2025, has been submitted which provides confirmation from the PA that the single storey rear extension to the subject dwelling is exempted development.

Appropriate Assessment Screening

- 5.3. This section should be read in conjunction with Section 8 and Appendix 2 of the Inspector's report. The applicant has submitted further information in the form of an updated Appropriate Assessment screening report prepared by Fitzgerald Ecology, and I acknowledge its expertise and qualifications as set out in Section 1.2 of the submitted screening report. The Commission should note that I have assessed the response below under the headings it used in its Section 132 request.

(a) Ecology Survey Methodology

- 5.4. It is clarified that on 31st July 2024 the entire site was surveyed and fully walked over in detail. The survey was conducted with reference to Smith et al. (2011) (*Best Practice Guidance for Habitat Survey and Mapping*), National Roads Authority (2009) (*Ecological Surveying Techniques for Protected Flora and Fauna during the Planning of National Road Schemes*) and CIEEM (2018) (*Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management*). The goal of the survey was to inform the AA Screening report. No transects or sampling points were established as the entire site was thoroughly surveyed and examined. The methodology included the recording of all native and non-native plants and habitats, potential roosting features for bats, testing of soil levels at intervals using a metal rod and measuring tape and recording of birds and mammals as incidental observations.
- 5.5. Additionally, in response to the Section 132 request, a further survey has been undertaken on 2nd October 2025 following the same survey method as before (however, the 2024 updated CIEEM was referred to). No fixed transects or sampling points were established and a comprehensive ecological walkover of the entire site and its immediate surroundings was undertaken to provide complete spatial coverage of dry heath habitats (*herein referred to as European Dry Heath or EDH*) and other ecological features within the vicinity of the proposed development. The Commission should note that the survey area is illustrated in Figure 3 of the submitted screening report. As a result of this survey, EDH was mapped in detail with the results provided

in Figure 4 of the submitted screening report. I note that no current EDH was recorded within close proximity of the development.

- 5.6. Having regard to the updated information provided by the applicant in relation to the survey methodology, together with the undertaking of a further survey of the site, I am satisfied that this section of the Section 132 notice has been adequately addressed.

(b) Development Description

- 5.7. The applicant has provided updated drawings (*including Map Nos. 001, 002 and 003*) which show the location of the current and previous owner's structures relative to the site and SAC boundary. An area illustrated purple on Map No.003 shows what is described as the previous owner's clearance in 2023. Screenshots from a social media video from the previous owner (*castaway.east*) are also provided which describe this as proof of clearance activity in February 2023.
- 5.8. The Commission should note that the appellant has raised a number of concerns regarding the applicant's contention that there was site previous site clearance, the timing of the photographs and the locations of photographs not representing their stated location. Firstly, I am satisfied that the imagery provided from February 2023 on Map 003 does clearly show that the lands as shown in purple were cleared by the previous owner. The appellant refers to imagery provided by the applicant in 2024 and 2025 which shows the lands in full bloom (*photograph marked item 2 of the appellant's submission*), however, I consider that this does not invalidate the details provided by the applicant that the lands were previously cleared in 2023.
- 5.9. Secondly, I have reviewed the photographs provided by the applicant, in particular plate numbers 5 and 6 within the submitted screening report, which declare this area as the location of the garage/boathouse to be retained. Plate number 5 shows a vegetable patch and plate number 6 shows a shed and glasshouse. I have also reviewed Google Earth Imagery (*from 7/11/2023*)¹ which clearly shows the approximate location of the garage/boathouse to be retained in an area consisting of previous structures and disturbed lands. The Commission should note that I am satisfied that submitted plate numbers 5 and 6 do represent the location of the current garage/boathouse to be retained. Therefore, I am satisfied that the area was

¹ <https://earth.google.com/web/@51.49995977,-9.54685134,13.9033401a,324.05823124d,35y,-0h,0t,0r/data=CgRCaggBOgMKATBCAggASgOI> ARAA (Accessed 13th January 2026)

previously disturbed prior to the commencement of the works to the garage/boathouse.

- 5.10. Thirdly, the appellant raises concern with the stated construction methodology outlined within section 2.4 of the screening report. It is stated that the development description provided by the ecologist is speculation. However, I note that the appellant has not provided any evidence to counteract the description provided by the ecologist. Notwithstanding this, the Commission should note that the subject site is connected to the pier via an existing road network. Whilst I note that EDH has been recorded along the public road network (*Figure 4 of the submitted screening report*), I am satisfied that any construction machinery would not have interfered with EDH coming to and from the site. Furthermore, the updated survey notes no current EDH within the vicinity of the completed/proposed works on site and scientific information is provided by the ecologist (*which I detail below within paragraph 5.15*) confirming that no EDH would have historically existed in proximity to the development. Therefore, I am satisfied that the construction methodology would not have likely resulted in a significant effect on EDH, or any other qualifying interest of the SAC and SPA, as well as the proposed works to complete the development.
- 5.11. The Commission should note that the appellant has questioned the floor area of the garage/boathouse stipulated by the ecologist within Section 2.4 of the screening report. I note that the 93sqm floor area described by the ecologist is the internal floor area of the structure and the wider footprint of the structure measures approximately 119sqm (*as measured on drawing no. 006 submitted as part of the application*). However, I consider the results of the walkover survey on 2nd October 2025 to be the material issue for the Commission which identified no EDH (currently or historically) in close proximity to the development, as well as the siting of the structure on lands that have been previously disturbed.
- 5.12. The appellant also has concerns that the location of the demolished stone chamber not being shown on submitted Map 001 and that the detached home office is not built at the location of this structure. The former structure is shown on the appellant's further submission (photograph and site layout plan) as closer to the dwelling's east elevation. The applicant has positioned it 12.7 metres from the dwelling. The Commission should note that both locations are located outside the SAC designation as shown on submitted Map 001. Having regard to this, to the results of the ecologist surveys which

recorded no EDH in close proximity to the site, and to my assessment within the Inspector's report in relation to the design and visual impact of the structure, I have no significant concerns with this structure to be retained.

Having regard to the updated information provided by the applicant and having regard to the submission from the third-party, I am satisfied that the applicant has adequately addressed this section of the Section 132 request.

(c) Habitats

- 5.13. The ecologist has outlined that no limitations were encountered during the survey and all lands in the study area were fully accessed and walked over with the exception of denser scrub habitats and private lands which were viewed from the edge. It is stated that EDH is a habitat type which is very condition specific, requiring thin (typically less than 10cm), free-draining, acidic-nutrient poor soils with significant bedrock exposure, especially on mineral substrates.
- 5.14. The Commission should note that the results of the survey recorded no EDH within the development or within its immediate boundaries, however, it was found scattered particularly to the west of the site along the roadway, which is consistent with what I observed on the date of my site inspection. The distance between the garage/boathouse and the nearest area of recorded EDH is 50 metres west.
- 5.15. In relation to whether any historical EDH that may have existed on the subject site, it is stated that the soil depths to the immediate south of the garage/boathouse varied between 30cm and 50cm and the substrate consisted of mineral soils rather than peat. EDH found on mineral soils would be typically on much shallower soils than on peat substrate. It is also stated that the area was previously heavily worked for arable agriculture in the past by previous owners and therefore the native soil depth has already been reduced. The ecologist also analysed historical aerial imagery and noted that the area of the garage/boathouse was a patch of green vegetation 25 to 30 years ago before the designation of the SAC. It is stated that 2009 google earth aerial imagery further illustrates this condition.
- 5.16. Having regard to the results of the onsite survey carried out by the ecologist, I am satisfied that the development has not and will not result in a likely significant effect on the conservation objectives of the SAC. Therefore, I am satisfied that the appropriate

assessment screening within the Inspector's report remains valid in light of this updated information.

(d) Habitat Loss and Fragmentation

- 5.17. It is stated that the previous arable agriculture carried out at the same site of the garage/boathouse, as well as the construction of the garage/boathouse would not have had any likely significant effect on the conservation objectives of the SAC regarding habitat loss or fragmentation, as the area is incompatible with any qualifying interests, including EDH, as recorded in the survey of the site and wider area in October 2025. It is acknowledged that the possible expansion of arable agriculture and other glamping activities to the south and east could have over time begun to impinge on and damage the EDH. There is a patch of EDH approximately 75 metres southeast of the garage/boathouse and the clearance of scrub for arable agriculture may have interfered with vegetation very close to the EDH patches.
- 5.18. Having regard to the above and taking into account the results of the survey of the site, the Commission should note that I am satisfied that the provision of infill and hardstanding to accommodate the permanent structures would not have likely resulted in a significant effect on the conservation objectives of the SAC.

(e) General

- 5.19. It is confirmed that no mitigation measures are proposed to be implemented as part of the proposed development. In terms of construction, as I have addressed above, it is my view that having regard to the access road being removed from any EDH habitat as well as the area of the proposed works within the site, that the construction methodology would not have likely resulted in any significant effect on the European site. I am satisfied that no mitigation measures would have been required for the works to be retained, and no further mitigation measures would be required for the works to be completed.

Overall Conclusion

- 5.20. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), on the basis of my conclusions within Section 8 and Appendix 2 of the Inspector's report, on the basis of the additional information provided by the applicant on 22nd October 2025 and to the further submission from the third party, I conclude

that the development to be retained / proposed development, individually or in combination with other plans or projects, would not have likely resulted or would 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 or remedial NIS) is not therefore required.

5.21. This determination is based on the following:

- The scientific information provided in the Screening report regarding the impact of the garage/boathouse development and updated ecological information and surveys submitted on the 22nd October 2025.
- The location of the European dry heath [4030] qualifying interest outside the subject site and to the 50 metre separation distance to the closest recorded area, as confirmed by the additional ecological survey on 2nd October 2025 and as illustrated on figure 4 of the updated AA screening report.
- 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/boathouse on previously disturbed lands (as shown by aerial maps from 1995, 2011-2013 and 2013-2018 from the National Monuments Service Historic Environment Viewer) and information/photographs provided by the applicant to the Commission on 22nd October 2025 with no historical evidence of the qualifying interest European dry heath [4030] near the development site.
- 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 screening determination of the ecologist of the PA.

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

Other Issues

- 5.23. I note that the appellant states that the building represents a dangerous structure, however, the issue of compliance with Building Regulations is evaluated under a separate legal code and thus need not concern the Commission for the purposes of this appeal.

6.0 Recommendation

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

7.0 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.

8.0 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, and the further plans and particulars received by An Coimisiún Pleanála on the 22nd day of October, 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

14th January 2026