



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ACP-323180-25

---

<b>Development</b>	Construction of dwelling and all associated site works.
<b>Location</b>	Shanakiel Court , (Rear of Rosemount) , Strawberry Hill, Sundays Well, Cork, Co. Cork
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Cork City Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2543867
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Martin Maloney
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Frances O'Leary
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None on file
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	13 October 2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Natalie de Róiste

# 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 The Appeal .....	8
7.0 Assessment.....	11
8.0 AA Screening.....	13
9.0 Recommendation.....	14
10.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	14
11.0 Conditions .....	14
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is a disused private tennis court to the rear of Rosemount, a large detached house set in its own landscaped grounds in the Sundays Well area of Cork city. The entrance to Rosemount is off Strawberry Hill to the east. Rosemount is surrounded by residential development – it is bordered to the east by the rear gardens of detached houses facing onto Strawberry
  
- 1.3. On the date of the site visit, all parking spaces on Soho Terrace were occupied. One car was parked on-street in Shanakiel Court.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to construct a new two-storey three-bedroom flat-roofed house (c. 206 sqm) on the former tennis court of Rosemount. It is proposed to subdivide the site, with a site of c. 1200 sqm for the new house, and more than twice that retained for the parent dwelling. A post-and-wire fence with deciduous hedging is proposed to subdivide the site, replacing the existing chainlink fence.

## 3.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 3.1. Decision

Grant permission.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### 3.2.1. Planning Reports

Two identical reports, one dated 02/07/2025, one redated 03/07/2025, summarised as follows:

- Site context, planning history, policy context, one third party submission noted.
- While previous permission has lapsed, the grant remains a material consideration.

- The design of the dwelling is acceptable, and the room sizes and widths meet the standards set by the Ministerial Guidelines. The garden exceeds development plan standards, and the landscaping and boundary treatments are acceptable.
- An east-facing first-floor window has potential for overlooking to the garden of a permitted house to the east – this should be omitted by condition.
- The rationale set out for the access is acceptable, and the Urban Roads and Street Design section is satisfied. Drainage and water is satisfactory.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Drainage Report – no objections subject to conditions.
- Urban Roads and Street Design – no objections subject to conditions
- Planning and Integrated Development (contributions report) – no objections subject to financial contribution

### 3.2.3. Conditions

Twelve conditions were attached, the majority of which were standard conditions.

- Condition 3 amended the development as follows:

The first-floor east facing window serving bedroom no. 3 shall be omitted/ removed and the opening closed up. To compensate for the loss of this window, the size of the north facing window serving bedroom no. 3 may be increased. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit revised drawings detailing these changes.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

- Condition 9 limited the vehicular entrance to 3 metres in width, in the interests of road safety.
- Condition 10 also concerned the entrance:

Prior to commencement, the applicant is required to ensure sightlines demonstrated on Drawing JHK185 - PA1 - 04 are achievable. The applicant is required prior to construction to remove vegetation to ensure sightlines are achieved. All costs associated with this condition to be borne by the Applicant.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

Referred to An Taisce, The Arts Council, DAU, Failte Ireland, Uisce Éireann. No reports received.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

Two on file, one from the appellant, one on behalf of Shanakiel Court Owners Management CLG. That from appellant covered issues similar to those raised in appeal. That on behalf of Shanakiel Court Owners Management CLG noted that the permission should be as per the settlement reached between parties in the High Court on Circuit on 29 January 2024 (copy enclosed).

## 4.0 Planning History

- ABP-303721-19 (Reg ref 18/37901)

Permission was granted by An Bord Pleanála on 3 July 2019 for construction of a house, new entrance and all associated site works.

The Board Inspector recommended a revised entrance, via the existing dwelling rather than via Shanakiel Court. The Board did not attach this amending condition. This permission was not implemented and has now lapsed.

#### On adjacent sites

Corsica Lodge, Strawberry Hill, Sundays Well, Cork (site to the west, under construction)

Reg ref 2241139 – permission granted for demolition of existing house and construction of new two-storey house.

Reg ref 2443286 – permission granted for change of house design to above.

#### The following case is referred to by the First Party

Rockville, Dunbur Road, Wicklow.

ABP ref PL27.318655 (WCC ref 2360146) – permission granted for demolition of existing house and construction of new house, with new vehicular entrance onto Dunbur Close and all associated works.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Cork City Development Plan 2022-28

- 5.1.1. The site and the surrounding area is zoned ZO 01 Sustainable Residential Neighbourhoods with the objective “to protect and provide for residential uses and amenities, local services and community, institutional, educational and civic uses.”
- 5.1.2. The following sections of the plan are of relevance to the appeal:
- Objective 8.22 National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH)*
- Chapter 11 Placemaking and Managing Development*
- Objective 11.1 Sustainable Residential Development*
- Objective 11.3 Housing Quality and Standards*
- New Residential Development Sections 11.66-11.68*
- Quantitative Standards for Houses Sections 11.106-11.111*
- 5.1.3. Rosemount was recorded as a house of special architectural interest with a regional rating in the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage survey undertaken in the city in 2011. However, it has not been added to the Record of Protected Structures.

### 5.2. National Policy

- 5.2.1. **Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (2019) and subsequent advice notes**
- 5.2.2. This sets out statutory guidance and standards in relation to the design of individual streets to promote safer and more vibrant streets.
- 5.2.3. **Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht 2011).**

Chapter 13 deals with works in the curtilage and attendant grounds of a relevant structure, with specific sections on boundary features, basement areas, hard landscaping, gardens, and car parking.

#### 5.2.4. **Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2024)**

5.2.5. These guidelines reiterate the National Planning Framework and the RSES priority of ambitious growth targets for cities and metropolitan areas, including delivering brownfield and infill development at scale within the existing built-up footprint. There is an emphasis on compact growth, and the provision of more houses and denser development in cities and towns in proximity to existing services and public transport.

#### 5.3. **Natural Heritage Designations**

The site is 7 km west of Cork Harbour SPA (004030).

#### 5.4. **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.

#### 5.5. **Water Framework Directive Screening**

5.5.1. The subject site is located in a built up area in Cork city, c. 430 metres north of the River Lee, within the Lee (Cork)\_090 sub basin (IE\_SW\_19L030800). The site is located on top of the ground water body Ballinhassig East (IE\_SW\_G\_004).

5.5.2. The proposed development comprises the provision of a house.

5.5.3. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

5.5.4. I have assessed the development 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 project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

5.5.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- the small scale and nature of the development
- the distance from the nearest water bodies and the lack of hydrological connections

5.5.6. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will 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.

## **6.0 The Appeal**

### **6.1. Grounds of Appeal**

One appeal was received, from the resident of 8 Shanakiel Court, to the northeast of the appeal site. Issues raised can be summarised as follows:

- No objection to the principle of construction of a house – the new entrance is the issue.
- In the previous application on the site, the Board inspector recommended the omission of the entrance, but was overruled by the Board. Given subsequent newspaper reports (newspaper article from Irish Examiner dated Sun 13 July 2025 attached,) on the recent Supreme Court case on the overruling of Inspectors' decisions, the Inspector's recommendation should be accepted.

- There is no existing entrance from Rosemount to Shanakiel Court, either vehicular or pedestrian, despite what is stated in the application. They are two completely separate and different areas.

## 6.2. Applicant Response

A response was received on behalf of the applicant, summarised as follows:

- The Supreme court decision [2025] IESC 31 has been misinterpreted by the appellant. This dealt with the issue of the time limits to take a judicial review, and did not address any questions regarding the allocation of cases to Board members, or the Board's reasoning for not accepting Inspectors' recommendations.
- In the previous grant of permission on the site (ABP-303721-19) the decision was taken by 2 Board members, was unanimous, and the reasons and considerations noted there would be no traffic hazard. The decision was legally sound.
- The provision of infill development on this appropriately zoned site, which is not within a Landscape Preservation Zone or Architectural Conservation Area, is in accordance with the aims of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-28. The provision of a new entrance is appropriate, to protect the character, residential amenity and historic setting of Rosemount House (NIAH no 20862017).
- The Board's decision disagreed with the Inspector, but had regard to, and concurred with, the assessment of the Local Authority traffic engineers. The current appeal ignores the rationale given by the Board for not accepting the Inspector's report, and is not based on any expert report, relying on one section of the Inspector's report from 6 years ago.
- The Inspector's report gave too much weight to the steepness and narrowness of the road, and not enough to the aim of compact and sustainable development, and the flexibility inherent in DMURS standards.

- It erred in the characterisation of the location of the entrance, which is not in the area used for turning and parking, and overstated the amenity provided by overgrown Leylandii trees.
- It referred only briefly to only one of three transport reports on the file, all of which were favourable towards the entrance.
- The Inspector did not set out why a DMURS-compliant entrance was unacceptable, and as such, the Board's dissenting conclusion was justified.
- The Inspector did not take into account the status of Rosemount as a structure on the National Inventory of Architectural History, and as such the Board was reasonable in dissenting.
- A settlement was reached in the High Court on Circuit on 29 January 2024, between the applicant and the Shanakiel Court Owners Management CLG, confirming that the applicant has the necessary wayleaves for the proposed vehicular access, and the Management Company has no objection to a repeat application for planning permission. This is an important endorsement of the Board's decision.
- Application ABP-318655-23 is a relevant precedent, with a development and decision similar to this one (new access for infill house, onto a cul-de-sac).
- In summary, the Board's Direction provided adequate reasons and considerations to reject the inspector's recommendation; the vehicular entrance is appropriate having regard to DMURS; impacts on the heritage structure, Rosemount; and the legal agreement between the majority of previous objectors and the applicant. A grant is in order.

### 6.3. Planning Authority Response

No response was received from Cork City Council.

### 6.4. Observations

No observations were received.

## 6.5. Further Responses

No further responses were received.

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and the material submitted by the applicant. I have inspected the site, and I have had regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance. I consider the substantive issues to be considered as follows:

- Principle of development
- Traffic hazard
- Neighbouring residential amenity
- Impact on built heritage

### 7.2. Principle of development

7.2.1. The provision of a new house on an infill site complies with national and city policy. In any case, the appellant has no issue with the provision of the house, only the entrance. The appellant notes that there has never been an entrance from Rosemount to Shanakiel Court, and that they are two separate and different areas. This is no impediment to the provision of a new entrance, subject to planning permission and an assessment against the policies and objectives of the Development Plan, compliance with national policy, and protection of surrounding amenities.

### 7.3. Traffic hazard

7.3.1. I inspected the site, and found the road serving Shanakiel Court to be very steep (but not particularly narrow) as far as the curve in the road, and relatively level at the closed end. It is not a busy road, or one with high speed traffic. It has a footpath to one side only, and the proposed new entrance is located on the other side of the road, opposite the existing driveway entrance for no 7 Shanakiel Court. This is a cul-

de-sac, and overwhelmingly used by residents who are familiar with the lane, and professional delivery drivers.

- 7.3.2. I note that (unlike the previous application) the route for construction traffic is proposed to be through the Rosemount site. The vehicular entrance is required for normal traffic generated by the use of the house only. An engineer's drawing (JHK185-PA1-04) shows that adequate sightlines can be achieved from the new entrance subject to tree removal, in accordance with the standards set by DMURS, and appropriate to the speed limit on the road. The turning area is unaffected. In my view, the proposed vehicular entrance is acceptable from the perspective of road safety, and I note the Urban Roads and Street Design Report of the council expressed no concerns subject to standard conditions.

#### **7.4. Neighbouring residential amenity**

- 7.4.1. I note that each house in Shanakiel Court has in-curtilage car parking, and there is little apparent demand for on-street car parking in the estate. One car was parked on-street during the site visit on a Monday morning, with no pavement parking or obstructions observed. There is a widened area of road suitable for turning or visitor parking to the west of the proposed entrance, and this was unobstructed on the date of my site visit. In my view, the new entrance would not inconvenience neighbours or impact on their day-to-day comings and goings, any more than the driveway entrances of the existing houses in Shanakiel Court. I note the previous inspector's report had regard to the narrow and steeply sloping roads in the wider area, including Soho Terrace and Rope Walk. These are characteristic of the area, and an unavoidable result of the natural topography and the nineteenth-century development of the area. In any case, the proposed routing of construction traffic through the Rosemount site will alleviate much of the inconvenience and impacts to neighbours.
- 7.4.2. It is proposed to remove a large number of *Chamaecyparis* (False Cypress) trees on the boundaries, within the blue line area. These are large evergreen trees, and I concur that a more appropriate tree type would improve residential amenities. It is my view that the provision of a new entrance will not have unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.

## 7.5. Impact on built heritage

- 7.5.1. I note Objective 8.22 of the Cork City Development Plan, which notes on the subject of structures given a rating of regional importance in the NIAH survey *“these Ministerial Recommendations will be taken into account when the Cork City Council is considering proposals for development that would affect the historic or architectural interest of these structures.”* The proposed access via Shanakiel Court will allow for the reinstatement of the landscaping to the mature grounds of Rosemount following construction, and protect the setting of the house. A condition should be attached to ensure this is carried out.

## 7.6. Other issues

- 7.6.1. A number of conditions are attached, the majority of which are typical and reasonable for the orderly development of residential developments. I note the amending condition 3, to omit a first-floor window located 3 metres from the boundary with a neighbouring rear garden, and provide a larger window facing the north (6 metres from the boundary, and 14 metres from the front of the appellant’s house, at an oblique angle). The first party has not appealed this condition, which I consider reasonable, nor has the appellant commented on it.
- 7.6.2. I consider condition 2 to be superfluous, with any subdivision or change of use requiring permission in any case, and I do not recommend attaching it.
- 7.6.3. I consider condition 9 to be confusing and contradictory. The vehicular entrance as proposed is shown consistently as 2.5 metres in width. I recommend this condition is not attached.

## 8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. Having regard to the nature and small scale of the proposed development and the distance from the nearest European site, no Appropriate Assessment issues arise, and it is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant effect, individually, or in combination with other plans or projects, on any European site.

## 9.0 Recommendation

I recommend a grant of permission.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to the nature and scale of the development, the location and context of the site, the policies, objectives, and standards of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-28, including *Objective 8.22: National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (NIAH)*, the standards and guidance set out in the Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets, it is considered that, subject to the below conditions, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area, would not create traffic hazard, and is 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, 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The first-floor east facing window opening serving bedroom no. 3 shall be omitted. To compensate for the loss of this window, the size of the north facing window serving bedroom no. 3 may be increased (to be no greater than the omitted window). Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall submit revised drawings detailing these changes.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity of future occupants, and in the interests of privacy of the neighbouring rear garden to the east.

3. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwelling shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

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

4. The glazing to all bathroom and en-suite windows shall be manufactured opaque or frosted glass and shall be permanently maintained. The application of film to the surface of clear glass is not acceptable.

Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.

5. The attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall submit details for the disposal of surface water from the site for the written agreement of the planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of flooding prevention.

6. Prior to commencement, the application is required to ensure sightlines demonstrated on Drawing JHK185-PA1-04 are achievable. The applicant is required, prior to provision of this entrance, to remove vegetation to ensure sightlines are achieved. All costs associated with this condition to be borne by the applicant.

Reason: to avoid traffic hazard and comply with DMURS.

7. Within 6 months of completion of the construction of the house, the temporary construction route shall be removed, and the soft landscaping reinstated.

Reason: to protect the setting of Rosemount, a house of special architectural interest, and to comply with *Objective 8.22: National Inventory of Architectural Heritage* of the Cork City Development Plan 2022-28.

8. Any damage to the existing road, footpath and services resulting from this development shall be repaired by the developer at his own expense, to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interest of orderly development.

9. The applicant shall enter into a Connection Agreement with Uisce Éireann to provide for a service connection to the public water supply and/or wastewater collection network and adhere to the standards and conditions set out in that agreement. All development shall be carried out in compliance with Uisce Éireann's Standard Details and Codes of Practice. Uisce Éireann does not permit Build Over of its assets. Where the applicant proposes to build over or divert existing water or wastewater services the applicant shall have received written Confirmation of Feasibility (COF) of Diversion(s) from Uisce Éireann prior to any works commencing.

Reason: To provide adequate water and wastewater facilities.

10. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 0800 to 1900 from Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0900 and 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

11. 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.

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.

12. Prior to commencement of development, the applicant or other person with an interest in the land to which the application relates shall enter into an agreement in writing with the planning authority in accordance with Section 94 and Section 96 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, unless an exemption certificate has been granted under section 97 of the Act, as amended. Where such an agreement cannot be reached between the parties, the matter in dispute (other than a matter to which section 96(7) applies) shall be referred by the planning authority or any other prospective party to the agreement, to An Bord Pleanála for determination.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Part V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, and of the housing strategy in the development plan for the area.

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.

---

Natalie de Róiste  
Planning Inspector

21 October 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ACP-323180-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	New house
<b>Development Address</b>	Shanakiel Court, (rear of Rosemount), Strawberry Hill, Sundays Well, Cork, County Cork.
<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>	State the Class here
<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><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</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>	<p>Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units – Sub Threshold Class 10(b)(iv) [Urban Development – 10 hectares – sub threshold]</p>

<p><b>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)?</b></p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b> <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> <i>[Delete if not relevant]</i></p>

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

## Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	ACP-323180-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	New house
<b>Development Address</b>	Shanakiel Court, (rear of Rosemount), Strawberry Hill, Sundays Well, Cork, County Cork.
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<p><b>Characteristics of proposed development</b></p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>Construction of a single house in an urban area, connected to public services.</p> <p>The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants.</p>
<p><b>Location of development</b></p> <p>(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).</p>	<p>The development is in a built up area, and would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other urban developments.</p>
<p><b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b></p> <p>(Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).</p>	<p>The development would not result in the production of significant waste, emissions, or pollutants, and there is no potential for significant effects, either by itself or cumulatively with other developments.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<b>Likelihood of Significant Effects</b>	<b>Conclusion in respect of EIA</b>

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

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

**DP/ADP:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)