



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-322799-25

Development	Construction of dwelling and associated site works
Location	Ballycurreen, Glounthaune, Co.Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	246192
Applicant(s)	Michael Finn
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellant(s)	Jean Nyhan
Observer(s)	Michael Finn Abina Finn John Jeffrey William Finn Dan Finn Colm Dillon Barry Murphy

Date of Site Inspection

3rd September 2025

Inspector

Matthew McRedmond

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	5
2.0 Proposed Development	5
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	5
3.1. Decision	5
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	7
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	10
5.0 Policy Context.....	10
5.4. Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028.....	11
5.5. Natural Heritage Designations	13
5.6. EIA Screening	13
6.0 The Appeal	13
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	13
6.2. Applicant Response	15
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	16
6.4. Observations.....	17
7.0 Assessment.....	17
8.0 AA Screening.....	25
9.0 Recommendation.....	25
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	25
11.0 Conditions	25
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening & Form 2 Preliminary Examination	
Appendix 2: AA Screening	

Appendix 3: Water Framework Directive Assessment

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The 0.5 Ha site is located in the townland of Ballycurreen, approximately 2km northeast of Glounthaune, County Cork. The site is positioned adjoining and within an existing agricultural field and access to the site is proposed off a new entrance from the L6993 (Killahoura North) local road to the west. There is a single storey dwelling to the south of the site beyond an existing cattle/sheep crush, which itself is located within the red line boundary of the site, and a dormer style dwelling on the west side of the road, opposite the subject site. The remaining surrounding area is predominantly characterised by agricultural farmland with some electricity infrastructure traversing these lands including pylons and overhead lines. There are significant level changes at the site with a ground level drop of approximately 4m from south to north.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought to construct a new dwelling, domestic garage, new vehicular entrance, new wastewater treatment system and all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority granted permission for the proposed development in May 2025, subject to 23no. standard conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Local Authority planning report had regard to the location of the site, planning history, national and local policy and to the referral responses and submissions made. Their assessment included the following:

- Although the applicant owns a home in Glanmire, home ownership does not preclude the building of a first home for permanent occupation in a rural area. Additional confirmation of family landholdings is required to ensure Objective RP 5-3 in relation to planning permission for a family farm or single landholding shall not normally exceed two permissions.
- Noted that site is located with the 'Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt' and has a high value landscape designation. Third party concerns in relation to visual impact are noted. Rationale required for siting of proposed dwelling, given opportunities for infill that would result to the south.
- The site can be integrated into the character of the area as it is north facing, similar to the dwelling to the south. Additional detail on landscaping is required including native species. Amendments also required to garage design including reduced height.
- Clarification on roadside boundary works is required in relation to achieving adequate sightlines.
- Due to separation distance of 60m, residential amenity impacts are not expected to occur.
- Sightlines of 50m to the north and 70m to the south are proposed which are to the satisfaction of the Area Engineer.
- No objection in relation to servicing of the site that includes connection to public watermain, water treatment system and percolation area and soakaways for surface water.
- Further information was recommended in relation to a number of items.

Further Information Response

3.2.2. The applicant submitted a further information response in April 2025, which included the following:

- Map of family landholding
- Topographic survey
- Cross sections of site

- Pole markers installed on site to show ridge line
- Revised garage design
- Revised sightline drawing with trees to be removed shown with replacements inside the site boundaries
- Revised landscaping plan
- Confirmation of gate to east to be used for agricultural purposes
- Letter of intent from landowner (father) to sterilise his lands for up to 7 years.

Planning Authority Response

3.2.3. The Planning Authority considered the submitted further information details to be acceptable and recommended a grant of permission.

3.2.4. Other Technical Reports

- **Area Engineer** – Recommended a grant of permission subject to conditions.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None on file.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. There was one submission on file. The main issues highlighted are as follows:

- Proposed sightlines not provided and are much less than the 50m proposed. Also unclear if 50m or 70m sightlines are being provided.
- Removal of hedgerows to provide sightlines is not aligned with RPS-22d, HE16-21d and GI14-9e of the 2022 CDP which require the retention of trees and hedgerows.
- The current hedgerow provides significant visual screening of ESB substations and pylons at Gogganstown and Ballynenelagh, less than 2km north.
- Changing the road boundary would impact the High Value Landscape character of the area.

- The proposed dwelling is visually overbearing in height and will dominate the home of the objector party. This does not respect the character of the area. Window orientations will also result in overlooking.
- Site of the proposed site is excessive and the proposed use of the unused portion of the site is unclear and may result in infill dwellings.
- Concerns about validity of letter of consent.
- The proposed site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the applicant has not provided evidence that they have an exceptional rural generated housing need. Current residence, if this is a 'first home', and ownership of residential property should be confirmed.
- No consultation in relation to the subject proposal. The subject site should be for a proven rural generated housing need, relocated lower in the field to respect the character of the area, and hedgerows are maintained and protected.

Applicant Response

3.4.2. The applicant provided a response to the submission on file by way of unsolicited further information, which is on the file. The applicant response to the submission may be summarised as follows:

- The objector, who is sister of the applicant, was consulted on a number of occasions, with a previous application withdrawn due to the proposed location of the house. The subject proposal is moved further down the site as a result.
- Adequate sightlines are provided and measured on site as being at least 50m in length.
- Detailed retention of existing hedgerow and additional landscaping are set out in submitted drawings. The existing hedgerow does not provide visual screening to the existing roadway or northerly winds as claimed by the objector, as this hedge is located to the east of their property. Proposed landscaping and the proposed house would provide visual screening from ESB infrastructure and protect from easterly winds.

- The proposed development has been purposely designed to fit into the landscape, not breach the ridge line as it is consistent with roof heights in the area and is designed with a traditional appearance to fit with the character of the area, which is consistent with Objectives RP5-22a, HE 16-21a and GI 14-9 of the CDP. This is further supported by topographical survey that shows the subject site is the same OD Level as adjoining dwelling belonging to the objector.
- The large windows proposed at ground floor level do not overlap with the objector's property or the proposed driveway and are designed to maximise energy efficiency, which is in keeping with recent permissions and character of the area.
- The area to the south of the proposed dwelling is to remain in use as an agricultural paddock, with the existing crush and access gate to remain in their current location and in their current use. Relocation of the proposed dwelling further down the site to the north, would be contrary to the objector's concerns in relation to infill dwellings. This argument has no merit and moving the dwelling further north/downslope would compromise solar gain objectives.
- The letter of consent was signed by the landowner, father of the objector and the applicant, and the statements by the objector are inflammatory in this regard.
- The Objector's claims in relation to section RP 5-3 are unfounded as the applicant has submitted all relevant information in relation to local need and requirement for construction of their first home in the rural area. The applicant was born and raised in the area and indicates an intention to take over the family farm.
- Contrary to the claims of the objector, there are a number of other properties along this stretch of road including parents of the applicant and other family members. The applicant would like the opportunity to build a first family home in the rural area where he grew up and provide a similar upbringing to his children.

4.0 Planning History

There is no planning history of relevance at the subject site. The following is the planning history for the existing dwelling on the west side of the road, opposite the subject site:

Cork CC Ref. 02/1338: Permission for dwellinghouse, double garage and treatment unit.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National and Regional Policy

- 5.1.1. A central aim of national policy (National Planning Framework/NPF) is to recognise the role of the rural countryside as a lived-in landscape and focusing on the requirements of rural economies and rural communities based on “agriculture, forestry, tourism, and rural enterprise while at the same time avoiding ribbon and over-spill development from urban areas and protecting environmental qualities”. The Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) reflects the NPF position.
- 5.1.2. Chapter 5 of the National Planning Framework (NPF) is entitled ‘Planning for Diverse Rural Places’ and it sets out to Strengthening Ireland’s rural fabric and supporting rural communities.
- 5.1.3. National Policy Objective 28 states the following:

Ensure, in providing for the development of rural housing, that a distinction is made between areas under urban influence, i.e., within the commuter catchment of cities and large towns and centres of employment, and elsewhere:

- In rural areas under urban influence, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic or social need to live in a rural area and siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements;*
- In rural areas elsewhere, facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside based on siting and design criteria for rural housing in statutory guidelines and plans, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements.*

5.2. **Section 28 Ministerial Guidelines**

- 5.2.1. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005) are relevant. The guidelines aim for proper planning of the countryside and a fair balance between accommodating housing needs of rural community and managing areas of acute development pressure.

5.3. **National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030**

- 5.3.1. The NBAP includes five strategic objectives aimed at addressing existing challenges and new and emerging issues associated with biodiversity loss. Section 59B(1) of the Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000 (as amended) requires the Commission, as a public body, to have regard to the objectives and targets of the NBAP in the performance of its functions, to the extent that they may affect or relate to the functions of the Commission. The impact of development on biodiversity, including species and habitats, can be assessed at a European, National and Local level and is taken into account in our decision-making having regard to the Habitats and Birds Directives, Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, Water Framework Directive and Marine Strategy Framework Directive, and other relevant legislation, strategy and policy where applicable.

5.4. **Cork City Development Plan 2022-2028**

- 5.4.1. The Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the statutory plan for the area. The site is designated as “Metropolitan Greenbelt” and in other parts of the plan referred to as “Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt”. Chapter 5 sets out the policies required for the continued sustainable development of the rural county.
- 5.4.2. Objective RP 5-2 relates to rural generated housing need and aims to sustain and renew established rural communities, by facilitating those with a rural generated housing need to live within their rural community.

Objective RP 5-3: County Metropolitan Cork Strategic Planning Area

- 5.4.3. The Metropolitan Cork Greenbelt is the area under strongest urban pressure for rural housing. Therefore, applicants shall satisfy the Planning Authority that their proposal constitutes an exceptional rural generated housing need based on their social and /

or economic links to a particular local rural area, and in this regard, must demonstrate that they comply with one of the following categories of housing need:

(a) Farmers, including their sons and daughters who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the family farm.

(b) Persons taking over the ownership and running of a farm on a full-time basis, who wish to build a first home on the farm for their permanent occupation, where no existing dwelling is available for their own use. The proposed dwelling must be associated with the working and active management of the farm.

(c) Other persons working full-time in farming, forestry, inland waterway, or marine related occupations, for a period of over seven years, in the local rural area where they work and in which they propose to build a first home for their permanent occupation.

(d) Landowners including their sons and daughters who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the landholding associated with their principal family residence for a minimum of seven years prior to the date of the planning application.

In circumstances, where a family land holding is unsuitable for the construction of a house, consideration may be given to a nearby landholding where this would not conflict with Objective GI 8-1 and other policies and objectives in the Plan. In this context a 'nearby landholding' may be construed to mean adjoining landholdings but not normally more than 1.5km from the prospective applicant's family residence. Proposals exceeding the 1.5km distance may be considered in exceptional circumstances on a case-by-case basis. The total number of houses within the Metropolitan Greenbelt, for which planning permission has been granted since 15th January 2015 on a family farm or any single landholding within the rural area, will not normally exceed two.

Objective RP 5-12: Purpose of Greenbelt

(a) Maintain a Green Belt for Metropolitan Cork with the purposes of retaining the open and rural character of lands between and adjacent to urban areas, maintaining the clear distinction between urban areas and the countryside, to

prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of built-up areas, to focus attention on lands within settlements which are zoned for development and provide for appropriate land uses that protect the physical and visual amenity of the area.

(b) Recognise that in order to strengthen existing rural communities' provision can be made within the objectives of this Plan to meet exceptional individual housing needs within areas where controls on rural housing apply.

5.4.4. Other relevant objectives contained in the County Development Plan include the following:

- Objective RP 5-22 – Design and landscaping of new dwelling houses in rural areas.
- Objective 5-23 – Servicing single houses in rural areas.
- Objective 16-21 – Design and landscaping of new buildings that require the respect of character, pattern and tradition of existing places.

5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

5.5.1. The site is not located within any designated site. The closest Natura 2000 site is the Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code: 004030) and Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code: 001058) which are located approximately 2.8km to the southeast of the site.

5.6. EIA Screening

5.6.1. There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment based on the nature, size and location of the proposed development and therefore no EIA is required in this instance. See completed EIA Pre-Screening and Preliminary Screening attached in Appendix 1 and 2 below.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1. 1no. third-party appeal has been submitted against the decision of Cork County Council to grant permission for the proposed development.

6.1.2. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

- Appellant lives directly across the road from proposed site.
- Concerns and uncertainty in relation to tree removal to provide adequate sightlines, which gives rise to road safety concerns and visual impact from hedge removal. Lack of detail on submitted drawings including 2.4m setback, roadside boundary, individual trees not identified, extent of works not shown and land to north is not in control of applicant to achieve necessary sightlines.
- Sightlines of 90 metres are required for roads with a design speed of 60km/h as per The Transport Infrastructure Ireland Rural Road Link Design Standard DN-GEO-03031. Sightlines of 50m are referred to, which are not adequate and appropriate sightlines are required for public safety.
- The Area Engineer should have required a yellow site notice, and their review of the proposed sightlines is unsatisfactory with no technical justification for their conclusion that site distances are acceptable.
- Concern in relation to the amount of hedgerow removal to achieve sightlines, which is a local landscape feature of visual and ecological value. This includes proposals to reduce hedgerow height to 1m. Retention of existing hedgerows should be prioritised as per Development Plan Policies RP5-22d, HE16-21d and GI14-9e. The applicant proposal to replace all trees that will be removed within the sightlines, to within the site boundaries is unsatisfactory.
- Hedge removal will also impact the 'High Value Landscape' and impact visual amenity which is contrary to Policy GI 14-9(a). The removal of substantial hedgerow will open up views of this site and impact a feature of landscape, cultural and visual value to the area. Removal of the hedgerow would increase visibility of electrical infrastructure from the appellant's home and remove a buffer to prevailing winds.
- Occupancy restriction should be imposed and there is also a concern in relation to future development of infill sites due to siting of proposal. This is contrary to the greenbelt designation of the site. Wording of occupancy condition is open to interpretation.

- Scale of proposal has the potential to visually impact and impact on privacy of appellant's property. Number, size and location of windows on western elevation are a particular concern. The proposal is not consistent with the character of the area as required by objectives HE 16-21a and RP 5-22a of the CDP.
- The proposal will lead to excessive excavation and ground modification.
- Loss of agricultural access and unclear future arrangements, with potential impacts on agricultural functions and greenbelt character. Practical functionality of the field and direct access to the land for machinery will be compromised as a result of the proposal and which is contrary to the Greenbelt designation of the site.
- Rural housing need in the Metropolitan Green Belt not adequately provided as the applicant already owns two homes elsewhere and within 8.7 miles of the subject site.
- A number of photographs illustrating interpretation of sightlines from the proposed dwelling are provided, showing views north and south along L6993.

6.2. Applicant Response

6.2.1. The applicant provided a response to the grounds of the appeal, which can be summarised as follows:

- Noted the appellant is a sister of the applicant, and claims the appeal is vexatious/frivolous, an abuse of the planning process and aimed at delaying the development.
- Previous applications were withdrawn due to a relocation of the proposed dwelling in agreement with the current appellant. A separate application was deemed invalid. This current application was considered an appropriate location for the dwelling and proceeded on the basis of family agreement.
- Suggested relocation further north would not be practical due to separation distance to parent's home and opportunities for infill, which is contrary to the claims of the appellant in relation to infill development being inappropriate.

- Relocation of the dwelling northwards would compromise solar gain and orientation of the house to maximise sunlight.
- The sightline information put forward by the appellant is contrary to the findings of two engineers, one of them being employed by Cork County Council who approved the proposal. Moving the house north would further compromise achievement of sightlines.
- Issues raised in the appeal in relation to visual impact, removal of hedgerows etc. have already been addressed in the Planning Authority assessment of the proposal.
- Adequate site notices were in place in relation to the proposed development, contrary to the claims of the appellant.
- Concerns raised in relation to occupancy condition are unfounded and unclear. The applicant will live in the house with no intention of additional building on land surrounding the site due to farm requirements.
- The appellant's claims in relation to excessive profiling and ground modification are unfounded, as the Planning Authority have considered the design of the proposal to be consistent with the provisions of the County Development Plan.
- The existing pen and access to the south will be retained for agricultural purposes and it is not in the interests of the applicant nor farm operations to allow otherwise.
- All submitted concerns have already been addressed by competent experts in the Planning Authority and the basis for the appellant's continual submissions on applications by the current applicant are not based on genuine planning issues.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority is of the opinion that all relevant issues have been covered in the technical reports as provided to the Commission as part of the appeal documentation.

6.4. Observations

A number of observations were submitted in relation to the subject appeal, mainly from neighbours of the applicant, some of whom are family related. The main points of these submissions may be summarised as follows:

- Support for young family to build home on parent's farm where he has provided assistance on the farm in spare time and at weekends. Would also allow his children to represent the local GAA team.
- Relocation would allow more time for the applicant on the family farm.
- Current landowner, father of the applicant, is due to have a knee operation and will rely even more on the assistance of his son on the farm. Relocating to this site for his son, would make farm work more manageable, will eliminate hours driven each week and will allow he (the applicant's father) and his wife to see Michael (the applicant), his partner and their grandkids every day.
- Observers seek for the appellant to withdraw the appeal, as it solely seeks to delay the development, and to withdraw would allow the family to move on in a positive manner.

7.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development and Compliance with Rural Housing Strategy.
- Sightlines
- Design and Amenity Impacts
- Other Issues – validation/site notice

7.2. Principle of Development and Compliance with Rural Housing Policy

7.2.1. The third-party appeal sets out a number of issues with the proposed development, including the principle of rural housing need based on the fact the applicant already

owns two houses elsewhere. While this is not the primary issue raised in the appeal, I consider this to be a fundamental issue to the acceptability of the proposal before other more detailed design issues should be assessed.

7.2.2. The site is located in an area designated as “Metropolitan Green Belt” within the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. The development plan states that this metropolitan green belt is the area under strongest urban pressure for rural housing and any proposal shall constitute an exceptional rural housing need based on their social/or economic links to the area. I note Objective RP 5-3 of the development plan that requires applicants to demonstrate their compliance with one of the categories for housing need. The full text of the objective is contained in section 5.4 above and the categories include farmers and their children seeking to build their first home, persons taking over the running of a farm, other persons working full-time in farming and landowners including their children who wish to build their first home on a landholding.

7.2.3. I note the last section of the objective, RP 5-3(d) that states the following in relation to exceptional, rural generated housing need:

(d) Landowners including their sons and daughters who wish to build a first home for their permanent occupation on the landholding associated with their principal family residence for a minimum of seven years prior to the date of the planning application.

7.2.4. I note the contents of form SF1 as submitted as part of the application. The applicant has indicated that he lived in the family home to the south of the subject site for a period exceeding 7 years. He has also indicated he attended national school at Knockraha National school, 2.5km north of the site, has had previous involvement with the local GAA club and works part time on his father’s farm, which he intends to take over the operation of, once his father is no longer able to do so. Having reviewed the documentation submitted, I am of the view that the applicant qualifies for consideration of a dwelling at this location as a son of a landowner who wishes to build a first home for permanent occupation on the family landholding.

7.2.5. The appeal submits that as the applicant already owns other houses, rural need is not satisfied in this instance.

7.2.6. I note the applicant provided details of a property at an address at White’s Cross where he resides, and ownership of another property at Glanmire. I note the report of

the Planning Authority that refers to a memo from Director of Services, Planning that clarifies home ownership does not preclude an applicant from building their first home in the rural area. On this basis, it is submitted by the Planning Authority that although the applicant owns two existing properties at other locations, he still qualifies for consideration for a dwelling at this location as he has not previously built a home in the rural area. The Planning Authority place particular emphasis on the reference to building in the rural area rather than owning a first home, which is not specifically referenced in Policy 5-3.

7.2.7. The applicant has adequately demonstrated they are a son of the landowner and they have lived in the area for a period exceeding 7 years, which is compliant with Objective RP 5-3(d). As the two existing properties owned by the applicant are not in the rural area, I am satisfied that he does not already own a dwelling on the family landholding and has illustrated appropriate connections to the area and a rural generated housing need in regard to the family farm. I further note the submissions of the applicant's father that indicates a reliance on the applicant in relation to farm activities, which further supports the rural generated need. I am therefore satisfied that the applicant complies with Objective 5-3(d) as he is the son of a landowner and seeks to build their first home on the family landholding.

7.2.8. Although not raised in the appeal I note the final paragraph of Objective RP 5-3 that states:

The total number of houses within the Metropolitan Greenbelt, for which planning permission has been granted since 15th January 2015 on a family farm or any single landholding within the rural area, will not normally exceed two.

I note the permission for a dwelling for the applicant's sister dating from 2002, on land to the west of the local road L6993, opposite the subject site. There are no records of any other permitted dwelling within the landholding. I am therefore satisfied that the number of dwellings permitted does not exceed two, and in any case, the previous permission was earlier than the indicated date of January 2015.

7.2.9. Having regard to the above, the applicant has demonstrated their compliance with the rural housing policy of the development plan, and I consider that the proposal constitutes an exceptional rural generated housing need as submitted by the applicant and as required under Objective 5-3 of the County Development Plan.

7.3. Sightlines

- 7.3.1. The appeal raises concerns in relation to the amount of tree removal to provide adequate sightlines, which gives rise to road safety concerns. The appeal submits that sightlines of 90 metres are required for roads with a design speed of 60km/h as per The Transport Infrastructure Ireland Rural Road Link Design Standard DN-GEO-03031. They also submit that sightlines of 50m are referred to, which are not adequate and appropriate sightlines are required for public safety.
- 7.3.2. It is proposed to construct a new entrance at the western boundary of the site with access onto the L6993/Killahoura North road. A layout drawing is submitted showing new splayed entrance and works including the lowering of the bank to 1m and removal of trees/hedgerow along the site's roadside boundary to provide sightlines to the north and south.
- 7.3.3. The report of the Area Engineer states that sightlines proposed are acceptable.
- 7.3.4. Having visited the site, I note that the L6993/Killahoura North Road is a narrow road that has a relatively straight alignment along the section near the site. Both traffic volumes and speeds are low. The speed limit on the public road is 60km/h. On my visit to the site and owing to the c.4m width on this 2-way road, I noted the traffic speeds to be less than this, although I make this observation without the benefit of a specific traffic speed survey.
- 7.3.5. TII Publication Geometric Design of Junctions DN-GEO-03060 (2023) states that a design speed of 60km requires a Y distance sightline of 90m to the near edge of the road measured from its intersection with the centre line of the minor road measured from a drivers eye (1-2m) and that a relaxation of 'x' distance to 2m can be applied at lightly trafficked local roads. For a design speed of 50km/hr, a visibility of 70m is required.
- 7.3.6. I note on drawing 'Proposed Entrance Details' submitted by the applicant, indicates sightlines of 50m from a point setback 2.4m from the roadside. I further note that the proposed sightlines will require hedgerow removal. I am satisfied that any hedgerow removal can be appropriately mitigated with replacement native planting and that an additional 'y' distance beyond 50m can be achieved when the 2m 'x' distance is applied, instead of the 2.4m used by the applicant.

- 7.3.7. I note the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan at Objective TM 12-8 (d) that seeks to ensure that all new vehicular accesses are designed to appropriate standards of visibility to ensure the safety of other road users. I also note the Area Engineer report on the proposal and their satisfaction with the sightlines proposed, having regard to the 2.4m 'x' distance on the submitted drawings.
- 7.3.8. TII publication 'DN-GEO-3031-10 – Rural Road Link Design' requires a minimum sightline of 90 metres for safe stopping distances at a design speed of 60km/h. I also note the TII Publication allows up to a 2-step relaxation in applicable safe stopping distances if certain road design parameters are provided. Relaxations include where the site is remote from a junction, remote from the site of other relaxations in design standards and where road speeds are reduced due to local geometry including uphill sections of road. The minimum safe stopping distance permissible at 60km/h is therefore 50m.
- 7.3.9. The appeal submits that lands to the north of the subject site that require hedgerow removal are not within the control of the applicant, however I note this land is within the blue line boundary of the wider landholding and therefore accept that it is within family ownership and may be appropriately managed.
- 7.3.10. I am satisfied that due to the low speeds, lightly trafficked and unmarked nature of the road, that sightlines of 50-60m at a relaxed 2m 'x' distance are reasonable and that they can be achieved at the entrance and that any required works are in the control of the applicant.
- 7.3.11. In conclusion, based on my own assessment of sightlines above, I consider that the proposed new entrance can be accommodated without resulting in traffic hazard or obstruction of road users.

7.4. Design and Amenity Impacts

- 7.4.1. The appeal raises concerns in relation to the visual impact of the proposal, the impact of hedgerow removal on the character and biodiversity of the area, and the impact of west facing fenestration in the proposed dwelling, that would impact on their residential amenity.
- 7.4.2. The application site is located within the 'Prominent and Strategic Metropolitan Greenbelt' and has a high value landscape designation. Objective RP 5-22

encourages new dwelling design that respects the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape. This objective includes the retention of existing trees and hedgerows. Objectives HE 16-21(d) and GI 14-9(e) reiterate this requirement.

- 7.4.3. The appeal raises concern in relation to the potential for infill development to the south of the proposed site and that the subject proposal should be relocated further north to avoid visual and residential amenity impacts. I am satisfied that the applicant has confirmed the logistical functionality of the paddock area and access to the crush and surrounding farm lands and that opportunities for infill development do not arise due to these requirements.
- 7.4.4. I note the front elevation of the proposed dwelling is facing north, consistent with the existing dwelling 70m to the south. The proposed dwelling will be set into a sloping site, and some cut and fill will be required. I consider the hillside location and the proposed planting along the northern boundary will mitigate the visual impact of the proposal from the wider area and assimilate the proposal into the character of the area.
- 7.4.5. The existing roadside, western boundary comprises a sod and stone ditch with mature trees. Hedgerow removal and reduction to 1m in height is required in order to achieve appropriate sightlines. Objective GI 14-9 of the Development Plan discourages proposals that necessitate the removal of extensive amounts of trees and hedgerows. The applicant proposes to replace the existing trees and hedgerows that are removed, within the site boundaries, which would allow sightlines to be achieved. The replacement species are indicated as being native species and I consider this an acceptable compromise.
- 7.4.6. I note the Planning Authority are satisfied that the removal and replacement of hedgerow at this location is acceptable. The removal of c.30m of hedgerow is not significant in the wider context of this rural area and once replaced with appropriate species, can add beneficially to native hedgerow in the locality. I note some of the existing trees are non-native, so a net benefit in biodiversity can be expected to occur in this regard once the replacement, native hedgerow, is established. I note the appellant's concern that existing species and size of trees to be removed are not provided by the applicant. A suitable condition can be attached to a grant of

permission to ensure relevant native species are replaced on a like for like basis, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority. This would be consistent with the requirements of Objective RP 5-22 as it provides for the appropriate landscaping and screen planting of the proposal.

7.4.7. The appeal raises an issue with regard to the residential amenity impact of the proposal with living room windows facing west towards their dwelling, while removal of existing hedgerows would remove a visual screen of electricity infrastructure further to the east. It is also submitted that the removal of hedgerow would interfere with the rural character of this 'High Value Landscape', including Objective GI 14-9 which seeks to protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork and should be resisted.

7.4.8. I note the separation distance of 60m from the proposed dwelling to the existing dwelling to the west. I further note the subject proposal includes mitigating replacement planting that will provide a visual buffer towards the west. The extensive landscaping plan submitted by the applicant will integrate the proposal into the rural area and provide for additional native planting. This is consistent with Objective GI 14-9 and can be further ensured by inclusion of an appropriate condition attached to any grant of permission. I am satisfied that the proposed dwelling is a sufficient distance from surrounding dwellings to remove any possibility of significant residential amenity impacts and will not pose a risk to the visual and environmental integrity of the High Value Landscape.

7.5. **Other Issues**

Excavation and Ground Modification

7.5.1. The proposed development is located down gradient of the dwelling to the south and I note that there are concerns regarding the potential negative impact excavation works can have on the surrounding landscape. The applicant has provided a topographical survey that shows the subject site is at the same topographical level as the dwelling to the west. The dwelling will be sited in the northern part of the site and will have a finished floor level of 84m and a ridge of 92.02m. The overall level of cut is given as approximately 1-2m and ridge heights are not out of character with the surrounding area given the variations in ground level.

- 7.5.2. I am of the view that the level of cut proposed is not excessive and can be appropriately absorbed into the hillside and further mitigated by the landscaping proposed. If the Commission is minded to grant permission, I recommend that a condition requiring landscaping details to be submitted for PA approval be included.

Validation Issues

- 7.5.3. Issues associated with validation of applications and colour of site notice, as raised by the appellant are noted. However, any issues with the validation of applications are a matter for the Planning Authority. Validation is not a matter for the Commission, and I do not propose to address these issues in this report. The application was the subject of a period of public consultation and open to public comment over a 5-week period, as is statutorily required for all planning applications, a yellow site notice was used and I note the appellants used this period to make written submissions, which I have addressed in preceding sections.

Occupancy Condition

- 7.5.4. The appeal raises a concern in relation to the occupancy condition attached to the grant of permission and states this may be open to interpretation in terms of members of the immediate family. Concern is also raised once the 7-year occupancy condition expires and the potential for further infill development. I note the concerns of the appellant in this regard, however, the concept of infill development is addressed by the applicant in relation to the requirements for farming purposes on the land to the south of the application site and an occupancy condition is a standard inclusion in relation to rural housing. I consider any additional, future applications that may arise will be considered on their own individual merits and would not be appropriately addressed as part of this application assessment.

7.6. Assessment Conclusion

- 7.6.1. Having regard to the foregoing and having reviewed the issues raised in the single third-party appeal I am satisfied that the applicant has illustrated appropriate rural housing need, adequate sightlines can be provided, replacement native hedgerow planting is proposed and the subject proposal is consistent with the rural character of the area. I therefore recommend that permission is granted.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. Having reviewed the details on file and having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the location of the site within a rural area, the absence of strong ecological and/ or hydrological connections, and the physical separation distances to European Sites, I consider the potential of likely significant effects on European Sites arising from the proposed development, alone or in combination effects, can be reasonably excluded.
- 8.2. Please refer to the attached appendices for detailed Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment.

9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1.1. I recommend that permission for the development be granted for the following reasons and considerations.

10.0 Reasons and Considerations

- 10.1.1. Having regard to the objectives of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, the nature, scale and design of the development which is consistent with Objectives 5-22, HE 16-21(d) and GI 14-9(e), the rural generated housing need illustrated by the applicant, which is consistent with Objective 5-3(d) of the Development Plan, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not adversely impact the character of the area or be seriously injurious to the visual or residential amenities of the area, and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. It is considered that the proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.0 Conditions

1.	The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 30 th
----	---

	<p>day of April 2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>(a) The proposed dwelling when completed shall be first occupied as the place of residence of the applicant, members of the applicant’s immediate family or their heirs and shall remain so occupied for a period of seven years thereafter, unless consent is granted by the planning authority for its occupation by other persons who belong to the same category of housing need as the applicant.</p> <p>(b) Before development commences, the applicant shall enter into an Agreement with the planning authority, pursuant to Section 47 of the 2000 Planning and Development Act providing for the terms of this occupancy requirement.</p> <p>(c) Within two months of the occupation of the proposed dwelling, the applicant shall submit to the planning authority, a written statement of the confirmation of the first occupation of the dwelling in accordance with paragraph (a) and the date of such occupation.</p> <p>(d) This condition shall not affect the sale of the dwelling by a mortgagee in possession or by any person deriving title from such a sale.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the proposed dwelling is used to meet the applicant’s stated housing needs and that development in this rural area is appropriately restricted to meeting essential local need in the interest of the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.</p>
3.	<p>No further housing development shall be carried out on lands outlined on map lodged with the Planning Authority on 20/11/2024 and 30/04/2025 for a period of 7 years from the date of Grant of this Permission. Before any</p>

	<p>development commences, or, at the discretion of the Planning Authority, to maintain the density of development at a level consistent with the amenities of the area. Authority, within such further period or periods of time as it may nominate in writing provision to this effect shall be embodied in an Agreement between the landowner and the Planning Authority pursuant to Section 47 of the Planning and Development act 2000.</p> <p>Reason: To maintain the density of development at a level consistent with the amenity of the area.</p>
4.	<p>Details in relation to the design and construction of the proposed entrance to the site shall comply with the detailed requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Prior to commencement of development, drawings and details in accordance with this condition shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety and visual amenity.</p>
5.	<p>The proposed garage/ shed building shall not be sold, let or otherwise transferred or conveyed as an independent building, save as part of the dwelling. The garage shall be for domestic use only and shall not be used for human habitation or for any commercial purpose. No wc shall be within the building and the proposed wc shall be omitted and this floor area shall be used as part of the garage.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of clarity and orderly development.</p>
6.	<p>The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of 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) A plan to scale of not less than 1:500 showing –</p> <p>(i) Existing trees and hedgerows, specifying which are proposed for retention as features of the site landscaping and which are being replaced</p>

	<p>(ii) The measures to be put in place for the protection of relevant landscape features during the construction period</p> <p>(iii) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs [which shall comprise predominantly native species such as mountain ash, birch, willow, sycamore, pine, oak, hawthorn, holly, hazel, beech or alder] [which shall not include prunus species]</p> <p>(iv) Details of screen planting [which shall not include cupressocyparis x leylandii]</p> <p>(v) Details of roadside/street planting [which shall not include prunus species]</p> <p>(c) A timescale for implementation</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, within a period of five 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.</p>
7.	<p>(a) The septic tank/wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(b) Treated effluent from the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area/ polishing filter which shall be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of</p>

	<p>Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(c) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution</p>
8.	<p>Prior to commencement of development, details of the proposed surface water drainage measures shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority and shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of traffic safety and to prevent flooding or pollution.</p>
9.	<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</p>

Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.
--

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.

Matthew McRedmond
Senior Planning Inspector

16th September 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP-322799-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a dwelling and all associated site works
Development Address	Ballycurreen, Glounthaune, Co. Cork
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, “Project” means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>Schedule 5, Part 2, 10 (b) (i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units</p> <p>Proposal is substantially less than the threshold</p>

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

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ACP-322799-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of a dwelling and all associated site works
Development Address	Ballycurreen, Glounthaune, Co. Cork
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed residential use is compatible with other uses in area, - Modest size and intensity of development - No significant use of natural resources or production of waste - No significant risk of pollution or nuisance - No significant risk of accidents / disasters to human health
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Located within rural area/Metropolitan Greenbelt - Local ecology only on site - No built heritage - No water features at the site - No designated sites at the site
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nature and scale of the development, - Lack of significant environmental sensitivities on the site, - Absence of significant in combination effects, there is no potential for significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA

There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
---	-----------------------------

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____

DP/ADP: _____ **Date:** _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 2 – AA Screening

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects

Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics

Brief description of project	Proposed dwelling and all associated works
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Small domestic development on 0.5ha site. Site in undeveloped natural grass / pastoral state, existing natural boundaries, located c 2.8km to European site, potential impact on ground water from effluent disposal and disposal of surface water, removal of natural vegetation may disturb species, significant amount of native planting proposed. The Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC are located c. 2.8km south.
Screening report	No.
Natura Impact Statement	No.
Relevant submissions	No submissions relevant to AA issues.

Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

One European sites is identified as being located within a potential zone of influence of the proposed development as detailed in Table 1 below. I note that no further range of European Sites is necessary for consideration in relation to this proposed development.

Table 1:

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
Great Island Channel SAC (001058)	Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140] Atlantic salt meadows (Glauco-Puccinellietalia maritimae) [1130]	2.8km south	Yes, proximity and potential surface water run off to Lough Mahon that is hydrologically connected to the Cork Harbour SPA	N

	Great Island Channel SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service			
Cork Harbour SPA (004030)	<p>Bird of Special Conservation Interest (SCI):</p> <p>Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis) [A004]</p> <p>Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005]</p> <p>Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017]</p> <p>Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028]</p> <p>Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048]</p> <p>Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050]</p> <p>Teal (Anas crecca) [A052]</p> <p>Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054]</p> <p>Shoveler (Anas clypeata) [A056]</p> <p>Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069]</p> <p>Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130]</p> <p>Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140]</p> <p>Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141]</p> <p>Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus) [A142]</p> <p>Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) [A156]</p>	2.8km southeast	<p>Yes, proximity and potential reduction in water quality to the Cork Harbour SPA.</p> <p>Surface water discharge during construction and operation.</p> <p>Process/foulwater discharge during operation.</p>	Y

	<p>Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157]</p> <p>Curlew (Numenius arquata) [A160]</p> <p>Redshank (Tringa totanus) [A162]</p> <p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179]</p> <p>Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182]</p> <p>Lesser Black-backed Gull (Larus fuscus) [A183]</p> <p>Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> <p>Great Island Channel SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

¹ Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³if no connections: N

Given the proximity of the site to Cork Harbour SPA and Great Island Channel SAC, potential effects could occur due to surface water run off during construction and operation and foul water discharge during operation, will require management to avoid impacts on SC.

Significant effects from other pathways have been ruled out i.e., habitat loss, spread of invasive species, impacts from noise and disturbance.

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

The proposed development will not result in any direct effects on either the SPA as it relates to Cork Harbour or the SAC as it relates to the Great Island Channel. However, due to the application of the precautionary principle, impacts generated by the construction and operation of the proposed development require consideration.

Sources of impact and likely significant effects are detailed in the table below.

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*
-----------------------------------	--

	Impacts	Effects
Site 1: Cork Harbour SPA (004030) QI list: Little Grebe (Tachybaptus ruficollis) [A004] Great Crested Grebe (Podiceps cristatus) [A005] Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) [A017] Grey Heron (Ardea cinerea) [A028] Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048] Wigeon (Anas penelope) [A050] Teal (Anas crecca) [A052] Pintail (Anas acuta) [A054] Shoveler (Anas clypeata) [A056] Red-breasted Merganser (Mergus serrator) [A069] Oystercatcher (Haematopus ostralegus) [A130] Golden Plover (Pluvialis apricaria) [A140] Grey Plover (Pluvialis squatarola) [A141] Lapwing (Vanellus vanellus) [A142] Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149] Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) [A156] Bar-tailed Godwit (Limosa lapponica) [A157] Curlew (Numenius arquata) [A160] Redshank (Tringa 19irsute) [A162]	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SPA.</p> <p>Indirect: Localised, temporary, low magnitude impacts from noise, dust and construction related emissions.</p> <p>Localized, low magnitude impacts on water quality (pollution and sedimentation) from surface water disposal from development and from on site effluent disposal.</p> <p>Removal of vegetation on site.</p>	<p>Having regard to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the domestic nature and small scale of development proposed, - lack of direct connections or pathways, - the distance to receiving features, - normal best construction practices, - disposal of uncontaminated storm water to ground, - disposal of effluent on site to normal EPA CoP standards, <p>it is highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality or QI species of the SPA.</p> <p>No significant disturbance to birds that may occasionally use the existing vegetation on the site.</p> <p>Low risk to SPA related to any minor construction related emissions.</p> <p>Low risk of surface or ground water borne pollutants or sediments reaching the SPA.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>

<p>Black-headed Gull (Chroicocephalus ridibundus) [A179] Common Gull (Larus canus) [A182] Lesser Black-backed Gull (Larus fuscus) [A183] Common Tern (Sterna hirundo) [A193] Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p>		
	<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N</p>	
	<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.</p>	
	<p>Impacts</p>	<p>Effects</p>
<p>Site 2: Great Island Channel SAC (001058) QI list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1140 Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide ▪ 1330 Atlantic 	<p>As above.</p>	<p>Having regard to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the domestic nature and small scale of development proposed, - lack of direct connections or pathways, - the distance to receiving features, - normal best construction practices, - disposal of uncontaminated storm water to ground, - disposal of effluent on site to normal EPA CoP standards, <p>it is highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect Qis of the SAC.</p> <p>Low risk to SAC related to any minor construction related emissions.</p> <p>Low risk of surface or ground water borne pollutants or sediments reaching the SAC.</p>

		Conservation objectives would not be undermined.
--	--	--

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

The construction or operation of the proposed development will not result in impacts that could affect the conservation objectives of the Cork Harbour SPA nor the Great Island Channel SAC. Due to distance and lack of meaningful ecological connections there will be no changes in ecological functions due to any construction related emissions or disturbance. There will be no direct or ex-situ effects from disturbance on mobile species during construction or operation of the proposed development. No mitigation measures beyond normal standard construction mitigation and drainage works are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

Having carried out Screening for Appropriate Assessment of the project in accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), I conclude that that the project individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites within the surrounding area namely, Cork Harbour SPA, Great Island Channel SAC or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site
- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites
- No ex-situ impacts

Appendix 3

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Comisiún Pleanála ref. no.	322799-25	Townland, address	Ballycurreen, Glounthaune, Co. Cork
Description of project		Construction of a dwelling and all associated site works	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		<p>Site is undeveloped pastoral land in a rural area No water features on the site or adjacent to the site. Site not located within a flood zone area. Site rises steeply and bank and ditches along roadside boundary. Site is c. 2.8km to Cork Harbour and is within the WFD Catchment of Lee, Cork Harbour and Youghal Bay</p>	
Proposed surface water details		Surface water to on site soakaway	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Uisce Eireann mains water connection	
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Onsite wastewater treatment system	
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection			

Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface runoff, drainage, groundwater)	
River	C140m north	BUTLERSTOWN_030 Code:IE_SW_19B060800)	Moderate	At risk	Agriculture, Urban Waste Water	Potential surface water runoff via drainage ditches	
Groundwater	Underlying site	Ballinhassig East Code:IE_SW_G_004	Good	Not at risk	None identified	Surface water drainage to ground Effluent treatment and disposal to ground	
Step 3: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Waterbody receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
	Surface	BUTLERSTOWN_030 Code:IE_SW_19B060800)	Surface run off	pollution and sedimentation	standard best practice construction	No	Screened out
	Ground	Ballinhassig East Code:IE_SW_G_004	underground	Pollution, ground filtration	standard best practice construction	No	Screened out

OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	BUTLERSTOWN_030 Code:IE_SW_19B060800)	Surface run off	pollution and sedimentation	SUDs features	No	Screened out
4.	Ground	Ballinhassig East Code:IE_SW_G_004	underground	pollution and ground filtration	On site drainage to BRE standards, WWTS to EPA CoP standards	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	NA						