



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-322586-25

<b>Development</b>	House with associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Lissard, Edgeworthstown, Co. Longford
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Longford County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2560046
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Refuse permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	First party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	14 <sup>th</sup> August 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Bébhinn O'Shea

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
2.0 Proposed Development .....	3
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	3
4.0 Planning History.....	5
5.0 Policy Context.....	6
6.0 EIA Screening.....	9
7.0 The Appeal .....	9
8.0 Assessment.....	10
9.0 AA Screening.....	14
10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening .....	14
11.0 Recommendation .....	15
12.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	15
13.0 Conditions .....	16

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Screening

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The site is located at Lisard, north of Edgeworthstown, in a rural area with pockets of forestry/woodland. The site is accessed from within the grounds of former Lissard House, from a lane traversing the estate which formerly led to Lissard House (now demolished). A cut stone entrance gate/pillars and laneway currently leads to existing stables north of the site. The site is east of this lane, bound mostly by a post and rail fence which has been planted with hedging and trees. The remains of a walled garden and other stone features are visible surrounding the site.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

The proposed development is described as a new two storey dwelling, augmentation of access road to existing entrance, wastewater treatment system, polishing filter area and all ancillary site works. The proposed dwelling is two storey, c 9 m in height with a large single storey return. It is proposed to alter the access lane to the stables to provide access to the site.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

The Planning Authority refused permission for three reasons:

1. Failure to demonstrate a rurally generated housing need for Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence as set out in the LCDP.
2. Design - excessive height, bulk, features and fenestration style fails to integrate and would be visually obtrusive therefore contravene section 4.8.12, CPO 4.44 and Annex 7 Rural Design Guidelines of the LCDP.
3. Failure to demonstrate that the proposed wastewater system can comply with the EPA Code of Practice and consequent risk to public health.

#### **3.1.1. Planning Reports**

The Planning Report

- assessed the development as a site located within a Rural Area of Strong Urban Influence as per the LCDP. It concluded that, as the applicants own a detached rural dwelling at Schoolland Ballinalee, in which they have resided for the past 19 years, they do not have a site specific need for a rural dwelling at Lissard as per CPO 4.24 of the LCDP;
- considered that dwelling was not compliant with section 16.4.5.7, policies DMS16.88 & DMS 16.89 and Annex 7 (Rural Design Guidelines) of the LCDP, which encourage traditional vernacular dwelling designs that create strong simple forms, due to its proposed excessive height, bulky nature, exposed chimney features, front elevation canopy style column feature and mock Georgian windows;
- noted that the percolation tests carried on the site were carried out under the EPA 2009 guidelines which have since been superseded and the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the 2021 EPA Code of Practice;
- considered the access acceptable and compliant with DMS 16.9 of the LCDP;
- screened out the requirement for Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment;
- recommended refusal, as per 3.1 above.

### 3.1.2. Other Technical Reports

None

### 3.2. Prescribed Bodies

Uisce Éireann: Standard conditions provided

DHLGH: Recommends an Archaeological Impact Assessment be sought by way of Further Information.

### 3.3. Third Party Observations

None

## 4.0 Planning History

### Site:

19/176 Permission granted to Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan for a proposed new two storey dwelling house, augmentation of access road to existing entrance, wastewater treatment system, polishing filter area and all ancillary site works. Expired on 03/02/2025

### Landholding:

07/317 Permission refused to Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan for a dwelling house with mini treatment plant and percolation area at Lissard, Edgesworthtown, Longford. This site is north-east within the landholding, at the location of ruins/former Lissard House

07/806 Permission refused to Fergal and Teresa Sheridan for a dwelling house with mini treatment plant and percolation area at Lissard, Edgesworthtown, Longford. This site is north-east within the landholding, at the location of ruins/former Lissard House

08/107 Permission granted to Fergal and Teresa Sheridan to construct a dwelling house with mini-treatment plant and percolation area at Lissard, Edgesworthtown, Longford. This site is north-east within the landholding, at the location of ruins/former Lissard House. This house has not been constructed.

### Other:

There a number of other planning history references for one or both of the applicants' in the area

00/74 Permission granted (Ferghal Sheridan) for erection of dwelling house at Garyandrew, Longford. Within site of 01/548 below. Permission not commenced.

01/548 Permission granted (Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan) for 5 No. 2 storey houses Garry Andrew Edgesworthtown

02/270 Permission refused (Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan) to construct a dwelling house with garage , mini-treatment plant and percolation area. (Site was within 01/548 but had be omitted by condition in the grant of permisison)

08/575 – Retention permission granted (Ferghal and Teresa Sheridan) for agricultural entrance into land Drumeel Ballinalee

19/140 – Permission refused (Ferghal Sheridan) for 7 No. 2 bedroom dwellings Chapel Lane, Edgeworthstown

22/211 – Permission granted (Ferghal Sheridan) for retention and completion of 4 houses granted permission under 04/1198 at Abhainn Glas, Edgeworthstown, Co Longford

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Longford County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 (LCDP)

- 5.1.1. Section 4.8.12 sets out Rural Settlement Strategy for the County. The Rural Typology map Figure 4.5 sets out two categories of rural areas.

***Rural Areas under Strong Urban Influence*** Areas which exhibit characteristics such as proximity to the immediate environs or close commuting catchment of large towns within the county with evidence of considerable pressure for development of housing owing to their proximity to such settlements. The policy in these areas is to facilitate housing development by people who have strong links to the particular rural area, who are an intrinsic part of the rural community. Such persons would normally have spent substantial periods of their lives living in the rural area as part of the established rural community, e.g. people employed in the rural area including farmers and their sons and daughters, people originally from the rural area and wishing to return, people wishing to reside near elderly parents to provide security and care, elderly parents wishing to live near other family members, people who would have grown up in rural areas seeking to build their home close to other family members, people working in rural areas such as teachers in rural schools.

***Rural Areas Elsewhere*** These areas are the residual rural areas of the county not under Strong Urban Influence which can range from strong rural areas where population levels are generally stable within a well-developed town and village and in the wider rural areas around them to structurally weaker rural areas which exhibit characteristics such as persistent and significant population decline as well as a

*weaker economic structure based on indices of income, employment and economic growth.*

(The site is within an area categorised as Rural Areas Elsewhere. See Appendix 2)

5.1.2. The LCDP continues:

*In respect of 'Rural Areas Elsewhere', the Council aims to accommodate rural housing demand from individuals for permanent residential development, subject to good planning practice by applying a more flexible approach in the assessment of planning applications which are primarily based on sustainable planning principles (appropriate siting and design and negligible impacts to existing amenities or sensitive environments). The requirement to demonstrate local housing need will not apply to applications within this designated area.*

5.2. Other relevant County Policy Objectives (not an exhaustive list)

**CPO 4.26** Accommodate demand from individuals for permanent residential development in defined 'Rural Areas Elsewhere', subject to sustainable planning principles (appropriate siting and design and the demonstration of negligible impacts to existing amenities or sensitive environments).

**CPO 4.27** Assess residential development in rural areas on the suitability of the area in terms of its sensitivity, its ability to accommodate development in a sustainable manner and compliance with the relevant technical criteria.

**CPO 4.28** Sets out circumstances where occupancy conditions will apply, i.e. in Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence.

**CPO 4.29** Restrict residential development on a landholding, where there is a history of development through the speculative sale or development of sites, notwithstanding the applicant's compliance with the local need criteria

**CPO 4.35** Have regard to the Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities, April 2005, and any replacement guidance which require that new houses in rural areas be sited and designed to integrate well with their physical surroundings and be generally compatible with: a) The protection of water quality in

the arrangements made for onsite wastewater disposal facilities; b) The provision of a safe means of access in relation to road and public safety; c) The conservation of sensitive areas such as natural habitats, the environs of protected structures and other aspects of heritage. In regard to septic tanks, the Planning Authority will be positively disposed towards the use of septic tanks and/or with additional package treatment systems, where necessary, with Irish Agrément Board Certification. In order to protect groundwater, all site suitability tests shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency's 'Code of Practice for Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses

**CPO 4.44** Prepare an updated 'Rural Design Guidance for Residential Developments in Rural County Longford' over the lifetime of the Plan. Until such time as this is prepared, all new housing in the rural countryside shall achieve the highest quality of layout and design in accordance with the Development Management Standards set out in Chapter 16 of this plan and the current Rural Design Guidance for Residential Developments in Rural County Longford set out in Annex 7 of this Plan.

**CPO 5.98** Ensure that private wastewater treatment plants, where permitted, are operated in compliance with EPA's.....Code of Practice Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (PE. ≤10) (EPA 2009), as may be amended.

The Landscape Character identified is Central Corridor, the sensitivity of the landscapes in this unit are stated to be generally "low" as per the Landscape Character Assessment (Annex 7 of the LCDP). Potential areas of "medium" to "high" sensitivity are stated to exist in the vicinity of protected woodlands, riverbank and in the vicinity of the aquifer.

### 5.3. **Built/ Natural Heritage Designations**

Ardgullion Bog SAC/pNHA c. 4.7 km to east

Glen Lough SPA/pNHA c 8km to south

Recorded Monument LF015-33 - Castle c.120 m northeast of site boundary.



## **6.0 EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

## **7.0 The Appeal**

### **7.1. Grounds of Appeal**

The appeal states:

- The site is established with extensive works already in place to accommodate a new house within the landholding. The walled gardens, stables and original features relating to Lissard House have been restored sensitively and the applicants wish to continue to develop the site sensitively. The site is located outside any Area of Special Control. The site is lower level topography with extensive planting within an existing farm holding.
- The stables on the landholding are not in residential use. The applicants' current home was inherited in the village on Ballinalee; they do not own a dwelling in the countryside.
- The applicant Ferghal Sheridan's family home is 800m from the site along with the family farm. The applicant keeps sheep and horses on a fulltime basis and aids in the full time running of the family farm. It is not practical to this from his current home in Ballinalee 8miles away during lambing/foaling season
- The applicant does not already own a house in the open countryside.

- The dwelling as designed was previously granted permission under planning reference 19/176. Mock Georgian windows are not proposed but timber windows with limestone details in keeping with the original structure on the site. Detail of entrance/chimney can be agreed with the Planning Authority.
- The Site Assessment Submitted was that of the 2019 application. The test criteria of the subsequent 2021 EPA Code of Practice remains the same. The proposal complies with EPA 2021 standards and the risk for pollution has not been demonstrated.

Supporting information including articles and photographs is included and is noted.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

No response

## **7.3. Observations**

None

## **7.4. Further Responses**

None

## **8.0 Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, 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:

- Rural housing need/principal of development
- Design/Impact on visual amenity/character of the area
- Wastewater disposal.

## **8.2. Rural housing need/principal of development**

- 8.2.1. The Planning Report has assessed the proposed development as being in a Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence. I have reviewed Figure 4.5 the Rural Typology Map within the LCDP, which is based on Electoral Divisions, and note that the site is outside the Edgeworthstown ED and within an area categorised as Rural Areas Elsewhere. As per CPO 4.26, policy here is to accommodate demand from individuals for permanent residential development subject to sustainable planning principles (appropriate siting and design and the demonstration of negligible impacts to existing amenities or sensitive environments). i.e. local need CPO 4.25 does not apply.
- 8.2.2. Noting that CPO 4.26 is intended to accommodate demand for *permanent* residential development I have reviewed planning history on the landholding and also reviewed other applications by the appellants. I note that permission appears to have been granted for a dwelling three times to the applicants under 19/176, 08/107 and 00/74 but that these dwellings were not constructed. I also note the other applications, listed at 4.0 above in this report, made by the applicants, but that these dwellings were not specifically intended for occupation by the applicants. This is consistent with information on 08/107 where the applicants state that they are builders and developers by profession.
- 8.2.3. I therefore conclude that the applicants qualify for consideration for dwelling in the rural area, subject other planning considerations. Having regard to CPO 4.29 an occupancy condition need not be applied.

## **8.3. Design/Impact on visual amenity/character of the area**

- 8.3.1. The concerns as set out in the decision of the Planning Authority are the excessive height, bulk, features and fenestration style of the dwelling, its failure to integrate and its visual obtrusiveness, contravening section 4.8.12, CPO 4.44 and Annex 7 Rural Design Guidelines of the LCDP.
- 8.3.2. I note Section 4.8.12 referred to in the reason for refusal is the entire Rural Settlement Strategy of the LCDP; I do not propose to revisit the entirety of this section. The proposed development has been assessed under relevant policies of the Rural Settlement Strategy and the matter now to hand is the design and visual

impact of the proposed dwelling. CPO 4.44, referenced in the reason for refusal, also refers to the Rural Design Guidelines.

8.3.3. Key considerations of the Rural Design Guidelines are Site selection, Site layout, Detailed house design.

- *Site selection:* The site is removed from the public road. The topography of the surrounding area is relatively flat. There are no important vistas or scenic routes in the vicinity. The site is surrounded by mature and recently planted vegetation which forms a backdrop. It does not break the skyline. I do not consider that the site, as selected, contravenes the Rural Design Guidelines.
- *Site layout:* The site utilises existing site features including landcover and access road and is positioned close to existing structures (stables, walls, access lane). The character of the proposed site is not consistent with that typically described in the Design Guidelines, as it is removed from the public road within a larger landholding. The extent of boundary/hedgerow to be removed is limited and not long established. I consider that the dwelling would be better sited towards a boundary, rather than positioned 'floating' in the middle of the site, as would traditionally have occurred in the interest of shelter. However, I consider that there is sufficient vegetation in the backdrop to absorb a dwelling in visual terms, and additional landscaping/planning may also be required by condition.
- *Detailed house design:* The Design Guidelines focus on traditionally reflective dwellings, i.e. simple shapes, avoiding bulky forms, simple/clean pitched/hipped roof forms, chimneys as important visual features, vertical emphasis on visible elevations, high solid-to-void ratio, finishes of painted nap plaster or rough/wet dash.

I agree with the opinion expressed in the Planning Report that the dwelling proposed has a bulky form, being 14.5m long x 10m deep. Its plan form however is simple, and I do not consider it excessive in height. I consider that it would benefit from a reduction in length and depth, better solid to void ratio and alternative style of fenestration and entrance treatment.

However, I do not consider it practical or reasonable to seek to address the

bulk of the dwelling by condition. While the design may not be of particular architectural merit, I do not consider that it is of such bulk that it would detract from visual amenity or the rural character of the area such that refusal is warranted. I consider that the site context will allow it to be visually absorbed. As such I accept the design as proposed in terms of bulk and consider other matters may be addressed by condition.

#### 8.4. **Wastewater disposal.**

- 8.4.1. The refusal by the Planning Authority relates to failure of the application to demonstrate compliance with the EPA 2021 Code of Practice.
- 8.4.2. The EPA 2021 Code of Practice (CoP): Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent  $\leq 10$ ) typically applies to site assessments and subsequent installations carried out on or after 7th June 2021. However, page 1 of the CoP states that *the 2009 CoP may continue to be used for site assessments and subsequent installations commenced before 7th June 2021*. The application contained a site suitability assessment carried out under the 2009 CoP, with tests carried out on 15/06/2019, and as such the 2009 CoP may be used in this instance.
- 8.4.3. I note that the refusal by the Planning Authority related to lack of demonstration of compliance with the 2021 CoP, rather than a particular aspect of the site suitability test results. In the interest of completeness, I have considered the site suitability test details submitted in light of the 2021 EPA Code of Practice. I note that:
- The 2009/2021 CoP are similar but the 2021 CoP provides additional options for poorly draining soil, which is not the case in this instance.
  - There is no requirement in the 2021 CoP in relation to seasonal timing of the test or length of validity of the test and there is no reason to consider that the drainage characteristics of the site have since changed.
  - Testing procedures are the same as the 2009 CoP and subsurface percolation value (T value) was within expected limits for the soil characteristics observed in the trial hole.
  - Groundwater Protection Response is R1; a domestic WWTP would be acceptable subject to normal good practice

- 8.4.4. I do not consider that any threat of pollution has been demonstrated. The proposed WWTP complies with the 2009 CoP and given the 2021 CoP allows for the installation to be considered in accordance with the 2009 CoP, I do not consider any contravention of CPO 4.35 and 5.98 occurs. Accordingly, I consider the wastewater disposal proposals acceptable.

## 9.0 AA Screening

The proposed development comprises the construction of a dwelling and associated site works.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development
- The location and distance from the nearest European sites Ardgullion Bog SAC and the lack of any hydrological connection to same
- Taking into account the screening report by Longford County Council.

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

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

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive Screening

- 10.1. The subject site is located north of Edgesworthtown within the Shannon Camlin\_SC\_010 sub catchment and within the Longford Ballinalee ground water body.

- 10.2. The proposed development comprises a new two storey dwelling house, augmentation of access road to existing entrance, wastewater treatment system, polishing filter area and all ancillary site works.
- 10.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal. (While noting the PA concern with the failure to apply the 2021 CoP, no specific concern was raised. See 7.4 above).
- 10.4. I have assessed the proposed dwelling and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the development I am satisfied that the development can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and nature of the development
  - The distance and lack of hydrological connections to waterbodies
- 10.5. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the development would not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

I consider that the proposed development meets the requirements of the LCDP and that permission should be granted subject to conditions.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the provisions of the Longford County Development Plan 2021-2027, the location and the characteristics of the site and the surrounding area, it is

considered that the proposed development would comply with County Policy Objectives CPO 4.26, CPO 4.27 and CPO 4.28, would comply with the relevant EPA Code of Practice for Domestic Waste Water Treatment Plants, and would not seriously detract from the visual amenity or landscape character of the area, and therefore would be acceptable.

## 13.0 Conditions

1	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, 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 the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2	<p>(a) Revised detail of simplified fenestration and entrance porch shall be submitted for the written agreement of the Planning Authority. Unless otherwise agreed, mock Georgian subdivisions in window panes shall be omitted and the porch shall be an enclosed structure, finished to match that of the main dwelling.</p> <p>(b) The roof colour of the proposed house and garage shall be blue-black, black, dark brown or dark-grey. The colour of the ridge tile shall be the same as the colour of the roof.</p> <p>(c) The external walls shall be finished in neutral colours such as grey or off-white.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
3	<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>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and to prevent flooding or pollution.</p>
4	<p>The site shall be landscaped, using only indigenous deciduous trees and hedging species, in accordance with details which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:</p> <p>(a) the establishment of a hedgerow along all boundaries of the site,  (b) planting of trees at intervals along the boundaries of the site, and  (c) a timeframe for implementation</p>



	<p>Any plants, trees or hedging which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to screen the development and assimilate it into the surrounding rural landscape, in the interest of visual amenity, and to comply with Section DMS16.93 of the Longford County Development Plan.</p>
5	<p>The wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled "Code of Practice: Wastewater Treatment Systems for Single Houses" Environmental Protection Agency, 2009, <b>or</b> "Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent <math>\leq</math> 10)" Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>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 relevant Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.</p> <p>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> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution</p>
6	<p>The developer shall engage a suitably qualified (license eligible) archaeologist to carry out an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) in advance of any site preparation works and groundworks, including site investigation works/topsoil stripping/site clearance/dredging and/or construction works.</p> <p>The AIA shall involve an examination of all development layout/design drawings, completion of documentary/cartographic/ photographic research and fieldwork, the latter to include, where applicable - geophysical survey, underwater/marine/intertidal survey, metal detection survey and archaeological testing (consent/licensed as required under the National Monuments Acts), building survey/ analysis, visual impact assessment</p> <p>The archaeologist shall prepare a comprehensive report, including an archaeological impact statement and mitigation strategy, to be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority in advance of any site preparation works, groundworks and/or construction works.</p>

	<p>Where archaeological remains are shown to be present, preservation in-situ, establishment of 'buffer zones', preservation by record (archaeological excavation) or archaeological monitoring may be required and mitigatory measures to ensure the preservation and/or recording of archaeological remains shall be included in the AIA. Any further archaeological mitigation requirements specified by the Local Authority Archaeologist, following consultation with the National Monuments Service, shall be complied with by the developer.</p> <p>The planning authority and the National Monuments Service shall be furnished with a final archaeological report describing the results of any subsequent archaeological investigative works and/or monitoring following the completion of all archaeological work on site and the completion of any necessary post-excavation work. All resulting and associated archaeological costs shall be borne by the developer.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the continued preservation [either in situ or by record] of places, caves, sites, features or other objects of archaeological interest.</p>
7	<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.

---

Bebhinn O'Shea

21<sup>st</sup> August 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	322586
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Dwelling house, wastewater treatment system, changes to entrance
<b>Development Address</b>	Lissard, Edgeworthstown, Co. Longford
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (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.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>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?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	S

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"/>	
No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	322586
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Dwelling house, wastewater treatment system, changes to entrance
<b>Development Address</b>	Lissard, Edgeworthstown, Co. Longford
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Proposal for single storey dwelling house, WWTP in rural area
<b>Location of development</b>  (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Rural area, not environmentally sensitive, removed from pNHAs and European sites with distant hydrological connection.  170m to nearest watercourse.  Area not designated for the protection natural heritage. Low landscape sensitivity  120m from recorded monument. AIA condition recommended.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	The development would not result in the production of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants.
<b>Conclusion</b>	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i>
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	