



Development

Refurbishment and extension to dwelling. Demolition of extensions and construction of extension together with associated site works.

Location

"The Bungalow", Gortatray, Barrings, Co. Cork

Planning Authority

Cork County Council

Planning Authority Reg. Ref.

245314

Applicants

Helen & Francesco Grassato

Type of Application

Permission

Planning Authority Decision

Grant permission

Type of Appeal

First Party against conditions

Appellants

Helen & Francesco Grassato

Observers

None

Date of Site Inspection

3rd of December 2025

Inspector

Siobhan Carroll

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	7
5.0 Policy Context	7
5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022 - 2028	7
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	8
5.3. EIA Screening	8
6.0 The Appeal	8
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	8
6.2. Planning Authority Response	14
7.0 Assessment	15
7.1. Scope of appeal	15
7.2. Condition no. 2	15
7.3. Condition no. 11	17
8.0 AA Screening	19
9.0 Water Framework Directive	20
10.0 Recommendation	21
11.0 Reasons and Considerations	21

12.0 Conditions 22

Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site with a stated area of 0.1hectares is located at Gortatray, Barrings, Co. Cork. It is situated on the southern side of the R579 circa 200m to the west of the junction with the Ballyshoneen Road, L6803. It lies approximately 1.5km to the north of the village of Barrings.
- 1.2. The site contains a bungalow which has been extended to the side and rear. The appeal site has frontage of circa 46m along the R579. The roadside boundary is defined by a low rendered and capped wall. The property is served by two gated vehicular entrances. The Owennagearagh River is situated circa 7m to the east of the site. There is a two-storey detached dwelling located circa 70m to the east of the appeal site. The site is bounded to the west and south by agricultural lands.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the refurbishment and extension of an existing dwelling house. The proposed development includes the demolition of 2 no. existing lean-to single storey extensions, the existing front entrance porch and the construction of a new front porch to the original existing dwelling. The proposed works to include associated site ancillary works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Cork County Council decided to grant permission by Order dated 6th of August 2025. The permission is subject to 16 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. Further information was requested in relation to the following on the 3/9/2024;
 1. The site is served by an existing septic tank and percolation area. However, given the age of the existing system and the proposed additional bedrooms a

site suitability assessment and new wastewater treatment proposal should be submitted.

2. Having regard to the proximity of the site to the Owennagearagh River and its proximity to both flood zones A and B, the applicant is required to prepare a flood risk screening assessment.

3.2.3. Clarification of further information was requested in relation the following on 24/5/2025.

1. It is noted that a revised proposal was submitted which was not requested. It is considered that the revised proposals would detract from the character of the existing dwelling and the visual amenities of the area. The applicants were requested to revert to the original design proposal as submitted on 12/7/2024.
2. A tertiary treatment system and infiltration area in compliance with the EPA Code of Practice 2021 should be shown on a revised site layout plan with the original extension design as reference above, altered as necessary to provide the required separation distances.

3.2.4. Report of the Planning Officer dated 6/8/2025 – It is stated in the report that there were no objections to the proposed demolition works. However, that the revised proposal would detract from the main part of the building. It is stated that the original proposal would be more respectful of the main building and it would integrate more successfully with the dwelling in this rural context.

3.2.5. Other Technical Reports

3.2.6. Area Engineer: report dated 2/9/2024 – further information was recommended in relation to the submission of a site suitability assessment and new wastewater treatment proposals.

3.2.7. Area Engineer: report dated 23/6/2025 – Deferral of decision was recommended and further information commended in relation to the submission of proposals for a tertiary treatment system and infiltration area in compliance with the EPA Code of Practice 2021 shown on the site layout plan with a house design similar to the proposal submitted in July 2024, altered as necessary to provide the required separation distances.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1. None

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. The Planning Authority did not receive any submissions/observations in relation to the planning application.

4.0 Planning History

4.1.1. Reg. Ref. 19/6650 – Permission was granted for (1) Retention of the existing extension to the front (north) elevation of the original dwelling house, (2) retention of the existing extension to the side (east) elevation of the dwelling house, (3) retention of the existing extension to the side (west) elevation of the dwelling house, (4) retention of the existing extension to the rear (south) elevation of the dwelling house, (5) retention of the existing structure for housing of a shrine to the side of the dwelling house and all associated site works.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022 – 2028

5.1.1. Chapter 16 refers to Built and Cultural Heritage

5.1.2. Objective HE 16-19: Vernacular Heritage – (a) Protect, maintain and enhance the established character, forms, features and setting of vernacular buildings, farmyards and settlements and the contribution they make to our architectural, archaeological, historical, social and cultural heritage and to local character and sense of place.

5.1.3. Objective HE 16-21: Design and Landscaping of New Buildings –(a) Encourage new buildings that respect the character, pattern and tradition of existing places, materials and built forms and that fit appropriately into the landscape.

5.1.4. Objective GI 14-9: Landscape – (a) Protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork's built and natural environment.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- 5.2.1. Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code 004030) is located circa 19km to the east of the appeal site.
- 5.2.2. Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code 001058) is located circa 25km to the east of the appeal site.

5.3. EIA Screening

- 5.3.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 in the Appendix 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

A first party appeal was submitted by Coakley O'Neill Town Planning on behalf of the applicants Helen & Francesco Grassato. The issues raised are as follows;

- Under Reg. Ref. 24/5341 Cork County Council granted permission for the proposed development on the 6th of August 2025. The applicants welcome the granting of permission for the subject development but seek the omission/amendment of conditions no. 2 and 11.
- The applicants request that the appeal is considered in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended).
- The planning permission being sought for the refurbishment and extension to the existing dwelling house on-site. The proposed works as initially submitted comprised of the following (a) Demolition of 2 no. existing lean-to, single storey extensions, the existing front entrance porch and structure (b)

Construction of new single storey extension to the rear, (c) New front entrance porch and all associated ancillary works.

- It is stated that while the proposed design changed over the course of the planning process but that the fundamental purpose, nature and scale of the proposed development has not.
- It is highlighted that the initial planning report raised no objection to the design of the proposed development and that no concerns were raised in relation to impacts on surrounding residential or other amenity.
- A request for further information was initially requested by the Planning Authority on the 3rd of September 2024. The items related to the provision of site suitability assessment and a new wastewater treatment proposal and a flood risk screening assessment was also requested.
- Following the submission of a further information response in November 2024 a request for clarification was issued on the 20th of December 2024 in relation to the provision of proposals for a tertiary treatment system and infiltration area.
- A further response was submitted by the applicants on the 29th of April 2025. This amended the layout and design of the proposed development from what was originally submitted to the Planning Authority on the 12th of July 2024 and incorporated a new secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter in accordance with the EPA's Code of Practice 2021.
- This incorporated a reduction in the overall footprint of the proposed extension and a redesign of the floor layout and elevations to the proposed development.
- The Planning Authority responded back to the applicants on the 24th of May 2025 noting that a redesign of the proposed development was not requested and asked that the proposal revert back to original scheme from the 12th of July 2024.
- A subsequent response from the applicants was submitted on the 6th of June 2025 noting the reasons for the redesign of the extension to incorporate the

new wastewater treatment system and to achieve the required separation distances in accordance with the Planning Authority's initial request.

- It is highlighted that the initial design proposal and subsequent redesign of the extension had to take account of the existing wayleave which was outlined on the submitted plans and which extends along the entirety of the southern boundary of the landholding from the northwest to the southeast corner of the site.
- Due to the proposed changes the applicants were requested to readvertise the planning application and erect new site notices which were submitted on the 11th of July 2025.
- The Council issued their decision to grant permission on the 6th of August 2025 subject 16 no. conditions.
- Condition no. 2 - The extensions to the dwelling shall be constructed in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted on the 12th July 2024 only, except where amended by the following provisions; The pitched roof extension to the rear (south-west) of the main part of the dwelling shall be reduced in length by a minimum of 1.5m and this modified extension shall be repositioned 1.5m to the north-west, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, having regard to the requirements of condition no. 11. The flat roof connecting link can be repositioned accordingly. A full set of revised plans shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.
- Condition no. 11 – Foul drainage shall be by means of a packaged secondary wastewater treatment unit, tertiary treatment system and infiltration area. This secondary treatment unit, tertiary system and infiltration area shall meet all the requirements of the Code of Practice, Wastewater Treatment Disposal System Serving Single Houses (p.e < 10) EPA 2021 and shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Prior to the commencement of the development a revised site layout plan showing the secondary treatment unit, tertiary treatment system and infiltration areas as well as the amended house layout as per condition no. 2 shall be submitted to

and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development. Reason: In the interest of public health.

- The Planner's report dated 6th of August 2025 notes the following in relation to the imposition of the conditions. "The Area Engineer considered that the issue could be resolved with minor revisions to the layout. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to deter the application again. As referenced in the previous Area Planner's report the building is shown on the last edition of the historic O.S map and she noted that alterations and extensions carried out over time. She was of the view that given that the demolition works relate to the extension elements and the main body of the bungalow as to be retained in full, she stated that the Planning Authority has no objections to the proposed demolition works and she was satisfied with the proposed extension. On balance, it is considered that the revised proposal would detract from the main part of the building. The substantial screening to the east is noted. It is considered that the original proposal is more respectful of the main building and it would integrate more successfully with the dwelling in this rural site context. As per a discussion with the Area Engineer and the A/SEP an option to address the engineering issue would be to reduce the length of the pitched roofed rear extension by 1.5m and reposition same 1.5m to the northwest. The connecting link could be repositioned accordingly. There may also have been an option to add further floorspace to this rear element, but it is not feasible to deter the application again. The Area Engineer attached conditions in his report dated 30/6/2025.
- It is submitted that both conditions are unwarranted and unnecessary in respect of the overall delivery of the proposed development. The imposition of both conditions will render the permission unimplementable given the constraints posed on the site in terms of the existing way leave and the proximity of the dwelling to the site boundaries and proposed wastewater treatment unit. It is submitted that the suggested changes will result in poor design outcomes.
- As part of a further information request the Planning Authority sought the provision of a new wastewater treatment system. The applicants submitted a

proposal addressing same, but the Planning Authority noted a Clarification Request that the separation distance for same were inadequate. As part of this request the Planning Authority acknowledged that the proposed layout of the extension may also need to be altered slightly.

- A revised layout and design were submitted by the applicants and set out the following wastewater treatment system design. The design that O'Connor Engineering Services Ltd, proposed was a secondary treatment system and soil polishing filter. The soil polishing filter has been designed as a tertiary treatment system in accordance with Section 10.1 of the EPA CoP 2021.
- There is no requirement for an infiltration area for the proposed soil polishing filter solution as the percolation value for the underlying subsoil is sufficient to deal with the effluent from the proposed filter. If a packaged tertiary treatment system and infiltration area is proposed (as recommended in the Council's FI letter) this will not treat the effluent to as high a standard as a soil polishing filter and we will still not be able to meet the separation distances table 6.2 of the Code of Practice.
- As per Section 6.4 of the Code of Practice a minimum of 500mm of unsaturated subsoil is required beneath the infiltration gravel bed for a packaged tertiary treatment system. It is the opinion of O'Connor Engineering Services that the use of the soil polishing filter proposed will treat the effluent to a better standard than a packaged tertiary treatment system and infiltration area.
- Having regard to the Council's subsequent RFI clarification which requested that the extension revert back to the original scheme design, a subsequent response from the applicants stated, "to achieve the necessary separation distances for the proposed wastewater system, we determine that it was necessary to adjust the overall footprint of the proposed extension resulting in a reconsideration of the original submitted floor layout and elevations to suit these findings. We would therefore argue that by virtue of these challenges, a redesign was inevitable.
- The applicants stated that they consulted with the Area Planner on May 29th and they were advised that they consult with the Area Engineer's Office. They

were advised that the original design submitted on July 12th 2024 is preferable even though the required separation distance for the proposed wastewater system is unworkable with that particular design.

- It is submitted that the Planning Authority must have been aware that any redesign of the wastewater treatment system would likely result in design changes to the dwelling.
- The reasoning for the imposition of condition no. 2 appears to be based on the view that the now proposed design will detract from the main dwelling in a way that the original proposal will not.
- It is highlighted that there are no residential amenity issues.
- The rationale for the imposition of condition no. 2 is set out in the final planning report which states, “as referenced in the previous Area Planner’s report the building is shown on the last edition of the historic O.S map and she noted that alterations and extensions carried out over time. She was of the view that given that the demolition works relate to the extension elements and the main body of the bungalow is to be retained in full, she stated that the Planning Authority has no objections to the proposed demolition works and she was satisfied with the proposed extension. On balance it is considered that the revised proposal would detract from the main part of the building. The substantial screening to the east is noted. It is considered that the original proposal is more respectful of the main building and it would integrate more successfully with the dwelling in this rural context.”
- It is highlighted that the site is not located within a high value landscape or in an area with scenic or visual amenity where concerns arise. The existing context should also be acknowledged. This is an older property with a number of ad hoc extensions over the years. Their demolition and replacement with new modern extensions should be seen in a positive light.
- It is submitted that the revised proposal does not detract from the main dwelling in any material or significant way. It is submitted that condition no. 2 is therefore unwarranted and unnecessary.

- It is also submitted that the applicants have achieved a reasonable and balanced approach to both the wastewater and design issues highlighted in the planning process to date.
- It is stated that the final proposal submitted to the Planning Authority represents the most optimal design solution in terms of delivering a dwelling unit that fits with the needs of the applicants while also ensuring a significant improvement to the existing building in terms of design and form. It is submitted that the design also protects the character of the existing cottage which maintains its prominence and is not unduly impacted.
- In conclusion, it is submitted that condition no. 2 is unwarranted and unreasonable. The imposition of condition no. 2 is based on an exaggerated consideration of the impact of the proposed extensions. The proposal should be seen in the overall context which includes the removal of existing unsuitable extensions.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

- Conditional permission was recommended, having regard to the location, nature and scale of the development, the policy and site context and the assessment and recommendation of the Area Engineer.
- Having regard to the change in personnel, it should be noted that the case was reviewed at team level, including the A/SEP, at each stage. It is noted that informal consultations were held between the Area Engineer and the agent. It was determined that the further information response constituted significant additional information on the basis of the new wastewater disposal system which was a significant addition to the initial development description. By way of clarification advise was provided on the requirements of condition nos. 2 and 11 and the possibility of submitting informal plans for comment prior to a formal compliance submission and, also, if a submission fell outside of the remit of these conditions, a proposal could be submitted by way of a new pre-planning submission.

7.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the appeal, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local policy and guidance, I consider the main issues in relation to this appeal are as follows:

- Scope of appeal
- Condition no. 2
- Condition no. 11

7.1. Scope of appeal

7.1.1. The proposed development entails permission for a refurbishment and extension of an existing dwelling house. The proposed development includes the demolition of 2 no. existing lean-to single storey extensions, the existing front entrance porch and the construction of a new front porch to the original existing dwelling. I have read all of the documentation attached to this file including the appeal and the report of the Planning Authority, in addition to having visited the site. The appellants have specifically requested that the appeal is considered in accordance with Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). Accordingly, I am satisfied that the appeal is against the imposition of Condition No. 2 and Condition No. 11 of the decision to grant permission. I consider it is appropriate that the appeal should be confined to Condition No. 2 and Condition No. 11 only and I am satisfied that the determination by the Commission of this application as if it had been made to it in the first instance would not be warranted and that it would be appropriate for the Commission to use the provisions of Section 139 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, in this case.

7.2. Condition no. 2

7.2.1. Condition No. 2 refers to the design of the proposed extensions it states,

2 The extensions to the dwelling shall be constructed in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted on the 12th July 2024 only, except where amended by the following provisions; The pitched roof extension to the rear (south-west) of the main part of the dwelling shall be reduced in length by a minimum of 1.5m and this modified extension shall be repositioned 1.5m to the north-west, or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Planning Authority, having regard to the requirements of condition no. 11. The flat roof connecting link can be repositioned accordingly. A full set of revised plans shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

7.2.2. The first party have requested that condition no. 2 be altered or omitted in order that the design of the extension be in accordance with the plans submitted to the Planning Authority on the 29th of April 2025. This proposed design entails the provision of extensions to the eastern and western side of the main dwelling. The design as originally proposed and detailed on plans submitted to the Planning Authority on the 12th of July 2024, entails the provision of extensions to the rear of the main dwelling with a short interconnecting section between the main dwelling and the rear extension located parallel to the dwelling with a setback of 1.8m. The main section of the extension would be located 5m further to the east than the original dwelling due to the configuration of the site. The rationale for the Planning Authority conditioning the design as originally proposed was on the basis that they considered that the revised proposal would detract from the main part of the building. It is set out in the appeal that the design submitted on the 29th of April 2025 is the most optimal design solution in terms of delivering a dwelling unit that fits with the needs of the applicants while also ensuring a significant improvement to the existing building in terms of design and form.

7.2.3. In relation to the design as granted I note that the development of the extensions primarily to the rear of the main dwelling would reduce the prominence of the proposed extensions. The front elevation of the main section of the dwelling which will be retained extends for 15m.

7.2.4. The design as proposed in the plans submitted on the 29th of April 2025 would result in the front elevation of the dwelling having a length of 24.5m. While I note that this would result in the front elevation of the dwelling extending by 10m I would also note that the elevational treatment includes gable features to the eastern and western sides of the property and the central porch also featuring a gable roof design. In that regard, I would consider that while the design which is preferred by the appellants does elongate the front elevation of the original bungalow, I do not consider that it is an incongruous design on the basis that there is a balance provided with the gable features proposed. I note that appeal refers to the existing right of way which runs along the extent of the western site boundary. As detailed on drawing no. 101 submitted on the 29th of April 2025 the proposed extensions would not be located within the existing right of way. Furthermore, I would note that the applicants highlighted that in order to achieve the necessary separation distances for the new effluent treatment system as required by the Planning Authority that a reconfiguration of the originally proposed design was required.

7.2.5. Accordingly, having regard to the details set out above, I would recommend that the wording of condition no. 2 be amended to specify that the extensions to the dwelling shall be constructed in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted on the 29th of April 2025.

7.3. **Condition no. 11**

7.3.1. Condition No. 11 refers to the design of the proposed on-site wastewater treatment system, it states,

11. Foul drainage shall be by means of a packaged secondary wastewater treatment unit, tertiary treatment system and infiltration area. This secondary treatment unit, tertiary system and infiltration area shall meet all the requirements of the Code of Practice, Wastewater Treatment Disposal System Serving Single Houses (p.e < 10) EPA 2021 and shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Prior to the commencement of the development a revised site layout plan showing the secondary treatment unit, tertiary treatment system and infiltration areas as well as the amended house layout as per condition no. 2 shall be submitted to

and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

- 7.3.2. It is requested in the appeal that the secondary effluent treatment system and soil polishing filter proposed in response the further information and submitted to the Planning Authority on the 29th of April 2025 be permitted in place of the secondary treatment unit, tertiary system and infiltration area as specified under condition no. 11 of the permission granted by the Planning Authority.
- 7.3.3. It is stated in the appeal that the soil polishing filter has been designed as a tertiary treatment system in accordance with Section 10.1 of the EPA CoP 2021. It is submitted in the appeal that there is no requirement for an infiltration area for the proposed soil polishing filter solution as the percolation value for the underlying subsoil is sufficient to deal with the effluent from the proposed filter. Furthermore, it is stated in the appeal that if a packaged tertiary treatment system and infiltration area is proposed (as recommended in the Council's FI letter) this will not treat the effluent to as high a standard as a soil polishing filter and we will still not be able to meet the separation distances table 6.2 of the Code of Practice. Section 6.4 of the EPA CoP 2021 specifies a minimum of 500mm of unsaturated subsoil is required beneath the infiltration gravel bed for a packaged tertiary treatment system.
- 7.3.4. O'Conner Engineering Services have advised the applicants that the use of the soil polishing filter proposed will treat the effluent to a better standard than a packaged tertiary treatment system and infiltration area which is required under condition no. 11. I also note that it is stated in the appeal that to achieve the necessary separation distances for the proposed wastewater treatment system that the applicants determined that it would be necessary to revise the design of the proposed extensions.
- 7.3.5. The submitted site characterisation records provides details of the testing carried out on site. Subsurface percolation testing was carried out and a T-test value of 8.39 was recorded. Surface percolation testing was also carried out and a P value of 19.08 was recorded. As detailed in the site characterisation form the results indicate that the site is not suitable for a conventional septic tank system but is suitable for the development of a secondary/tertiary treatment system discharging to

groundwater. As proposed under the details submitted to the Planning Authority on the 29th of April 2025 a secondary effluent treatment unit and soil polishing area is proposed to the rear of the dwelling. It is proposed to remove the existing topsoil layer across the entire footprint of the infiltration area to a depth of 91.4m and install the sand filter. I note the recommendation of O'Conner Engineering Services that the proposed soil polishing filter will treat the effluent to a better standard than a packaged tertiary treatment system and infiltration area and that the percolation test results indicate that the site is suitable for secondary effluent treatment. Furthermore, I note the proposed new on-site effluent treatment system would represent an environmental improvement based on the fact that it would be replacing an existing septic tank.

- 7.3.6. Accordingly, on the basis of the submitted site characterisation records and details set out above, I considered that it would be appropriate that the secondary effluent treatment unit and soil polishing area proposed under the details submitted to the Planning Authority on the 29th of April 2025 be permitted in place of the place of the secondary treatment unit, tertiary system and infiltration area as specified under condition no. 11 of the permission granted by the Planning Authority.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered case ABP-323545-25 in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.
- 8.2. The closest European Sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network, is Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code 004030) which is located circa 19km to the east of the appeal site and Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code 001058) which is located circa 25km to the east of the appeal site.
- 8.3. The proposed development comprises refurbishment and extension to a dwelling.
- 8.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.
- 8.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and scale of the proposed development and the location of the site on developed serviced lands.
- The absence of any ecological pathway from the development site to the nearest European Site.
- Location-distance from nearest European site.

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

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

9.0 Water Framework Directive

9.1. The subject site is located at the Gortatray, Berrings, Co. Cork. It is situated on the southern side of R579 circa 18km to the west of Cork City Centre. The Owennagearach River (SHOURNAGH_040) a tributary of the River Lee is located 11m to the east of the appeal site. Inniscarra lake (IE_SW_19_138) is located 3.7km to the south of the appeal site. The ground waterbody Ballinhassig East (Code IE_SW_G_004) underlies the site.

9.2. The proposal comprises the refurbishment and extension to a dwelling and the installation of a new secondary effluent treatment system and soil polishing filter, on a 0.1 hectare site, at Gortatray, Berrings, Co. Cork. The grounds of appeal have not raised the matter of the Water Framework Directive.

9.3. The Planning Authority granted permission, and no issues were raised by Environmental Health, the treatment of wastewater was not raised in the grounds of appeal, and I have no reason to believe that effluent cannot be treated on the site.

9.4. I have assessed the proposed 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 waterbodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

9.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The nature and small scale of the development.
- The proposed secondary treatment of on-site effluent.

Conclusion

9.6. 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.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1.1. Having regard to the above assessment, I recommend that the subject conditions number 2 and number 11 be amended, for the reasons and considerations set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1.1. It is considered that the proposed extensions, by reason of their limited scale, nature and design, would not detract from the character of the dwelling and would not seriously injure the amenities of the area, subject to the amendments required under the specified Condition no. 2. Having regard to site size and characteristics, it is considered that it would be appropriate that the secondary effluent treatment unit and soil polishing area proposed under the details submitted to the Planning Authority on the 29th of April 2025 be permitted in place of the place of the secondary treatment unit, tertiary system and infiltration area as specified under condition no. 11 of the permission granted by the Planning Authority. I therefore recommend that condition no. 2 and no. 11 be amended.

12.0 Conditions

Condition No. 2 - The extensions to the dwelling shall be constructed in accordance with the plans and particulars submitted on the 29th of April 2025.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

Condition No. 11 - Foul drainage shall be by means of a secondary wastewater treatment unit and soil polishing area as detailed in the document submitted to the Planning Authority on the 29th of April 2025. This secondary treatment unit, and soil polishing area shall meet all the requirements of the Code of Practice, Wastewater Treatment Disposal System Serving Single Houses (p.e < 10) EPA 2021 and shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. Prior to the commencement of the development a revised site layout plan showing the secondary treatment unit, and soil polishing area shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

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.

Siobhan Carroll
Planning Inspector

15th of December 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 323545-25
Proposed Development Summary	Refurbishment and extension to dwelling. Demolition of extensions and construction of extension together with associated site works.
Development Address	"The Bungalow", Gortatray, Berrings, 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 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 checked="" 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 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>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: _____