



An
Coimisiún
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ACP-323754-25

Development	Construction of three dwellings and associated site works
Location	Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	254251
Applicant	William Kenneally
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant permission
Type of Appeal	Third Party
Appellants	1. PJ Colfer 2. Colm Hayes
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	2 nd of December 2025
Inspector	Siobhan Carroll

Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description	4
2.0 Proposed Development	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision	4
3.1. Decision	4
3.2. Planning Authority Reports	5
3.3. Prescribed Bodies	6
3.4. Third Party Observations	7
4.0 Planning History.....	7
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022 – 2028	8
5.2. Natural Heritage Designations	11
5.3. EIA Screening	11
6.0 The Appeal	12
6.1. Grounds of Appeal	12
6.2. Applicant Response	17
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	19
6.4. Further Responses	19
7.0 Assessment.....	20
7.1. Compliance with the Development plan.....	20
7.2. Residential and visual amenity.....	22
7.3. Vehicular access and traffic	23
7.4. Surface water drainage and flood risk.....	25
7.5. Other issues.....	27

8.0 AA Screening.....	27
9.0 Water Framework Directive	28
10.0 Recommendation	29
11.0 Reasons and Considerations.....	30
12.0 Conditions	30
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 2 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening	
Appendix 3 – Water Framework Directive Screening	

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is situated in the village of Ladysbridge, Co. Cork. Ladysbridge is located approximately 2km to the south of the village of Castlemartyr. It is situated circa 11km to the east of Midleton and circa 33km to the east of Cork City.
- 1.2. The village is generally rural in character and has a limited range of facilities and services, comprising of a petrol station with shop, a pub and community facilities.
- 1.3. The site is located on the eastern side of the village and to the south of the R633 (Ballymacoda road). The site is roughly rectangular in shape, has a stated area of 0.281 hectares. It has frontage of approximately 60m onto the R633 to the north. The roadside boundary is defined by a hedgerow. There is an agricultural gate located to the north-western side of the site. The southern boundary is defined by a hedgerow. Immediately to the east of the site lies a single storey detached dwelling which is elevated above the road and setback from the road circa 28m. There are a further three detached dwellings to the east of that property.
- 1.4. To the west of the site there is a single storey detached dwelling which is accessed off the local road the L863. Na Banta housing estate lies to the north of the appeal site on the opposite side of the R633. It contains a mix of two-storey and three-storey dormer detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of three dwellings and associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. In an Order dated 8th of September 2025 the Planning Authority granted permission subject 11 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

3.2.2. Further Information was requested in relation to the following matters;

1. The Planning Authority has serious concerns regarding the siting/design of the proposed dwellings due to the elevated nature of the site and the level of cut/excavation required in order to facilitate the proposal.

You are requested to reconsider the proposal and revise the overall site strategy to minimise the level of landscape excavation required to accommodate this development. In this regard you are advised to consider the following:

Re-locate the proposed dwellings such that they are sited on a less elevated part of the site, i.e. further northwards towards the public road. A frontage type development may be a more suitable solution and the applicant should consider further architectural input to achieve a viable solution. In addition and to support this revision, you may wish to consider the entrance arrangement. A single entrance may be more beneficial in terms of reducing the level of hardstanding/platforming required to accommodate the proposed development. A footpath along the extent of the roadside boundary is also likely to be required. You are invited to contact the Planning Authority in this regard.

2. The trees/hedges located immediately to the west of the site entrance inhibits sightlines in this direction and would therefore need to be reduced to 1m in height above the road level. A letter of consent from the landowner is therefore required.
3. You shall outline how it is proposed to manage increased surface water runoff from the site due to the increase in hard standing areas and outline proposals on how you intend to prevent this from flooding onto the public road.

3.2.3. Following the submission of a response to the further information the Planning Authority considered that the information submitted with the application was not yet sufficient to enable them to make a decision. A request for a clarification of further information was sought in relation to the following;

1. Please note the submitted Drainage plan for the controlling of the Surface Water needs greater consideration to cater for the steepness of the site and to prevent any surface water from leaving the site and adding to the public road drainage, soakaways etc. Drainage detail needs to demonstrate the parameters along with the size of the proposed pipework etc. The surface water drainage detail must be a robust design future proofing the site.
- 3.2.4. Following the submission of response to the clarification of further information the Planning Authority they were satisfied with the details provided and a grant of permission was recommended.
 - 3.2.5. Other Technical Reports
 - 3.2.6. Area Engineer – Report dated 10/6/2025 – Clarification is sought with regard to the following issues: Drainage plan for the controlling of the Surface Water needs more design to cater for the steepness of the site and the to prevent any surface water from leaving the site and adding to the public road drainage, soakaways etc. Drainage detail needs to demonstrate the parameters along with the size of the proposed pipework etc. The surface water drainage detail must be a robust design, future proofing the site.
 - 3.2.7. Area Engineer – Report dated 8/9/2025 – Revised vehicular entrance layout and sightlines are satisfactory. Revised drainage plan, location of dwellings and percolation areas have sufficient detail provided in the submitted plans. Drainage is sufficient and satisfies part 2 of the Justification Test. Flood Risk Assessment complete and makes sufficient account of downstream effects and future scenarios in the design of drainage. No objection subject to the attachment of conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

- 3.3.1. Transport Infrastructure Ireland – Submission dated 7/3/2025 - The proposed development is located in a study area for a future national road scheme. The Authority recommends that the planning authority consult with the local Road Design Office (RDO) in considering this application.
- 3.3.2. Transport Infrastructure Ireland – Submission dated 31/7/2005 – With reference to the further information submitted in connection with the above planning application, the Authority's position remains as set out in the letter of 7/3/2025.

3.4. Third Party Observations

- 3.4.1. The Planning Authority received 4 no. observations/submissions in relation to the application. The main issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeals.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1.1. Reg. Ref. 24/5729 – Permission was sought for the construction of a new two storey dwelling, new wastewater treatment system and percolation area, new vehicular entrance off the R633 and all associated site development works. At Site 1 Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork, P25AE03. The application was withdrawn.
- 4.1.2. Reg. Ref. 24/5865 – Permission was sought for the construction of a new two storey dwelling, new wastewater treatment system and percolation area, new vehicular entrance off the R633 and all associated site development works. At Site 2, Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork, P25AE03. The application was withdrawn.
- 4.1.3. Reg. Ref. 24/5866 – Permission was sought for the construction of a new two storey dwelling, new wastewater treatment system and percolation area, new vehicular entrance off the R633 and all associated site development works. At Site 3 Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork, P25AE03. The application was withdrawn.
- 4.1.4. Reg. Ref. 24/5706 – Permission was granted for alterations to existing cottage, a new single storey extension to rear of existing cottage, new wastewater treatment unit and all associated site development works at Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork. On adjacent site to the west.
- 4.1.5. Reg. Ref. 22/6344 – Permission was granted for the demolition of a roof of the existing cottage and its south-eastern corner, its conversion into a patio enclosure and construction of new single storey two bedroom dwelling house with front driveway and parking spaces for 2 no. cars, a treatment unit with percolation area, and landscaping and all other associated site works. On adjacent site to the north-west.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022 – 2028

- 5.1.1. Volume Four refers to South Cork and Section 3.15 refers to Ladysbridge.
- 5.1.2. The appeal site is located within the development boundary of the village of Ladysbridge as indicated on the Map of Ladysbridge contained on page 307 of Volume Four of the Development Plan.
- 5.1.3. Section 3.15.4 refers to development boundary objectives for Ladysbridge.
- 5.1.4. Objective No. DB-01 – Within the development boundary of Ladysbridge encourage the development of up to 40 houses during the plan period.
- 5.1.5. Objective No. DB-02 – Part of the settlement is at risk of flooding. See flood risk objectives in Volume One, Chapter 11 ‘Water Management’.
- 5.1.6. Volume One refers to Main Policy Material
- 5.1.7. Chapter 3 refers to Settlements and Placemaking
- 5.1.8. County Development Plan Objective PL 3-5: Rural Placemaking - The Plan acknowledges that there are distinct and regional patterns of development within the rural villages and rural areas of County Cork and these make a positive contribution to the County’s settlement network and rural landscape. New buildings should respond to the historic placemaking patterns and built form prevalent in the area.
- 5.1.9. Chapter 11 refers to Water Management
- 5.1.10. County Development Plan Objective WM 11-10: Surface Water, SuDS and Water Sensitive Urban Design
 - (a) Require that all new developments incorporate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). Efforts should be taken to limit the extent of hard surfacing and impermeable paving.
 - (b) Encourage the application of a Water Sensitive Urban Design approach in the design of new development or other urban interventions. Opportunities to contribute to, protect or re-enforce existing green infrastructure corridors or assets should be maximised.

(c) Optimise and maximise the application of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) to mitigate flood risk, enhance biodiversity, protect and enhance visual and recreational amenity; all in the most innovative and creative manner appropriate and in accordance with best practices. Proposals should demonstrate that due consideration has been given to nature based solutions in the first instance in arriving at the preferred SuDS solution for any development.

(d) Provide adequate storm water infrastructure in order to accommodate the planned levels of growth expected for the County.

(e) Where surface water from a development is discharging to a waterbody, appropriate pollution control measures (e.g, hydrocarbon interceptors, silt traps) should be implemented.

(f) The capacity and efficiency of the national road network drainage regimes will be safeguarded for national road drainage purposes.

5.1.11. County Development Plan Objective WM 11-16: Flood Risks – Overall Approach

Take the following approach in order to reduce the risk of new development being affected by possible future flooding:

- Avoid development in areas at risk of flooding; and
- Apply the sequential approach to flood risk management based on avoidance, substitution, justification and mitigation of risk.
- Where development in floodplains cannot be avoided, applications for development must meet the definition of Minor Development or have passed the Justification Test for Development Plans in the updated SFRA and can pass the Justification Test for Development Management to the satisfaction of the planning authority.
- Consider the impacts of climate change on the development.

In areas where the Justification Test for Development Plans has not been applied, or has been failed, the sequential approach should be applied as follows:

- In areas where there is a high probability of flooding - 'Flood Zone A' - avoid highly and less vulnerable development as described in Section 3 of 'The

Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ issued in November 2009 by DoEHLG.

- In areas where there is a moderate probability of flooding - ‘Flood Zone B’ - avoid ‘highly vulnerable development’ described in section 3 of ‘The Planning System and Flood Risk Management – Guidelines for Planning Authorities’ issued in November 2009 by DoEHLG.

- In areas where there is low probability of flooding – ‘Flood Zone C’ all uses may be considered subject to a full consideration of all flood risks.

5.1.12. County Development Plan Objective WM 11-17: Development in Flood Risk Areas

When considering proposals for development, which may be vulnerable to flooding, and that would generally be inappropriate as set out in Table 3.2 of the Guidelines, the following criteria must be satisfied:

1. The subject lands have been zoned or otherwise designated for the particular use or form of development in an operative development plan, which has been adopted or varied taking account of these Guidelines.
2. The proposal has been subject to an appropriate flood risk assessment that demonstrates:
 - a. The development proposed will not increase flood risk elsewhere and, if practicable, will reduce overall flood risk;
 - b. The development proposal includes measures to minimise flood risk to people, property, the economy and the environment as far as reasonably possible;
 - c. The development proposed includes measures to ensure that residual risks to the area and/or development can be managed to an acceptable level as regards the adequacy of existing flood protection measures or the design, implementation and funding of any future flood risk management measures and provisions for emergency services access; and
 - d. The development proposed addresses the above in a manner that is also compatible with the achievement of wider planning

objectives in relation to development of good urban design and vibrant and active streetscapes.

The acceptability or otherwise of levels of residual risk should be made with consideration of the type and predicted future use of the development and the local development context.

The development is assessed not to have the potential to give rise to negative or adverse impacts on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites or Natural Heritage Areas or proposed Natural Heritage Areas.

5.1.13. Chapter 18 refers to Zoning and Land Use

5.1.14. County Development Plan Objective ZU 18-3: Development Boundaries – For any settlement, it is a general objective to located new development within the development boundary, identified in this Plan that defines the extent to which the settlement may grow during the lifetime of the Plan.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

5.2.1. Ballycotton SPA (Site Code 004022) is located approximately 5km to the south-east.

5.2.2. Ballymacoda (Clonpriest and Pillmore) SAC (Site Code 000077) is located approximately 6.5km to the east.

5.2.3. Ballymacoda (Clonpriest and Pillmore) SPA (Site Code 004023) is located approximately 7.4km to the east.

5.2.4. Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code 004030) is located approximately 9.6km to the south-west.

5.2.5. Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code 001058) is located approximately 8.7km to the west.

5.3. EIA Screening

5.3.1. 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.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

Third party appeals were submitted by (1) PJ Colfer and (2) Colm Hayes. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:

(1) PJ Colfer

- The raised the matter of the site notice and when it was erected on the site.
- The appeal refers to the details provided on the planning application form specifically part 4.4 which states, “do you own any of the land which adjoins, abuts or is adjacent to the site.” The answer provided was no, however as indicated on the Site Layout and proposed Overall Site Layout document indicated the adjoining property to the west is owned by the applicant.
- County Development Plan Objective DB-01 is highlighted. It states that within the development boundary of Ladysbridge encourage the development of up to 40 houses during the plan period.
- It is submitted in the appeal that Ladysbridge is overdeveloped. Under Reg. Ref. 24/4857 permission was sought for the development of 26 no. dwellings at Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge. The application was withdrawn when it was highlighted that the estate would have 45 no. houses if permission was granted for the 26 no. dwellings.
- Since 2022 when the County Development Plan was adopted, 32 no. dwellings were developed in Pairc an Chosain and 19 houses are under development in Ardchriocha. Therefore, it is stated that since the Development Plan was adopted that 51 houses have been developed in Ladysbrige with the possible addition of a further 10 houses under Reg. Ref. 25/5079.

- The appeal refers to County Development Plan Objective HE 16-21 which sets out to encourage the design of the buildings to reflect the character, pattern and tradition of what is existing and to ensure that the materials fit appropriately within the landscape.
- Section 3.15 of Volume 4 of the Development Plan refers to Ladysbridge and states that the vision for Ladysbridge is to retain its traditional rural character, adequately protect the Architectural Conservation Area in the village and encourage small scale sympathetic residential development in tandem with the provision of employment and services.
- The site context is highlighted. To the west of the site under Reg. Ref. 22/6344 permission was granted for a single two-bedroom bungalow. Under Reg. Ref. 24/5706 permission was granted for a single storey extension to the existing cottage. There is a row of three bungalows to the east of the site.
- It is submitted that the proposed three dwellings are which are of two-storey design rather than bungalows and with a proposed white rendered finish do not respect the character, pattern or tradition of existing places.
- The appeal refers to the following policies, objectives and sections of the Development Plan which it stated should have been considered.
- RP 5-22: Design and Landscaping of New Dwelling Houses and Replacement Dwellings in Rural Areas. Section 5.6 Environmental and Site Suitability Requirements. Section 14.8 which refers to Landscape Character Assessment of County Cork. County Development Plan Objective G14:9 Landscape. County Development Plan Objective G14-15: Development on the Approach to Towns and Villages. County Development Plan Objective BE15-6: Biodiversity and New Development. Section 15.7.5 which refers to the loss of trees. Section 15.11.3 which refers to artificial light. County Development Plan Objective RP5-24 Ribbon Development. Section 5.6 Environmental and Site Suitability Requirements.
- The appeal refers to the issue of ribbon development. It is stated that policy RP 5-24: Ribbon Development applies and that it should have been considered by the Planning Officer when assessing the proposal. It is

highlighted that while the three houses are within the development boundary it will cause a ribbon development by joining the two bungalows to the west of the development with the three bungalows to the east of the development which are also ribboned to a further two houses east of that, resulting in 10 houses in a row on the roadside.

- The report of the Planning Officer stated in relation to impact on amenity that the reduction in height/position on the hill should help reduce the visible prominence of the proposed dwelling when viewed from the vantage point of objector's properties.
- It is submitted in the appeal that the proposed development will break the ridgelines of houses to the east and west of the site. It is submitted that from the vantage point of the appellant's property that the development will break the skyline and that the siting, design and scale of the houses are not appropriate to the surroundings. It is submitted that the proposed dwellings would have a significant visual impact.
- Regarding the sightlines at the proposed vehicular entrance the Planning Officer's primary report states, 'the recent proposal was deemed acceptable with sightlines improved through modifying the existing trees/hedging to the west. Revisions to same will be required to improve this issue. It is stated that there were no revisions to the west. Boundary changes were proposed to the east. The report of the Planning Officer in response to the further information also refer to the west boundary, it states, 'the trees/hedges located immediately to the west of the site entrance inhibit sightlines in this direction and would therefore need to be reduced to 1m in height above the road level. A letter of consent from the landowner is therefore required.
- It is stated that there was no letter of consent from the landowner. The report of the Planning Officer stated, "the revisions to the entrance have addressed this matter." The appellant expresses concern that with no changes to the western boundaries the issues have not been addressed. The appellant also raised concern that a footpath was not proposed along the roadside boundary.

- Section 3.15.3 of Volume 4 of the Development Plan refers to Ladysbridge and states, 'Any further residential development in the village should also ensure that safe pedestrian connectivity to the village centre is provided.'
- The appeal refers to County Development Plan Objective BE 15-6: Biodiversity and New Development part (b) refers to encouraging the retention and integration of existing trees, hedgerows and other features of high natural value within new developments. Reference is made to section 15.7.5 which states that "Development can, if not sensitively designed, located and built, result in a loss or damage to important trees. The Council has a presumption in favour of retaining existing trees as a first preference in the formulation and assessment of development proposals."
- Reference is made to a section of the report of the Planning Officer which refers to landscape intervention, "The reduction of landscape intervention was considered to be of greater importance than the reduction of ridge lines bearing in mind the site is within the approved development boundary and benefits from a rising backdrop to the rear. Two neighbouring dwellings are also position at similar/higher finished floor levels albeit their ridgelines will be lower than the proposed dwellings. Visual impacts associated with the proposal are locally isolated and positioned on approach to the village core."
- The appellant does not consider that the approach was appropriate because the reduction of landscape intervention was considered to be of greater importance than the reduction of the ridge lines.

(2) Colm Hayes

- The appeal refers to the site notice and that date that it was erected.
- Reference is made to the application form which stated that the applicant did not own land which adjoins, abuts or is a adjacent to the site. The application drawing, Proposed Site Layout and Proposed Overall Site Layout documents indicate the adjoining dwelling to the west is owned by the applicant.
- County Development Plan Objective DB-01 states, within the development boundary of Ladysbridge encourage the development of up to 40 houses during the plan period. The report of the Planning Officer stated that the

application was acceptable in principle subject to normal and proper planning considerations.

- The appellant considers that the issue of up to 40 houses during the plan period was not adhered to. The appellant is of the opinion that Ladysbridge is overdeveloped. They highlighted that under Reg. Ref. 24/4857 permission was sought for 26 no. dwellings at a site at Ard Chriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge and that the application was withdrawn when it was highlighted that the development would have resulted in the provision of 45 houses during the plan period. Under Reg. Ref. 25/5079 permission was granted for 10 no. dwellings at the site at Ard Chriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge.
- It is submitted that the proposed development does not respect the character, pattern and tradition of existing places.
- The appeal refers to other recent planning applications made in Ladysbridge. Reg. Ref. 22/6344, Reg. Ref. 24/5706 and Reg. Ref. 22/5847.
- The appeal refers to the following Development Plan objectives/sections which it states should have been considered. RP5-22: Design & Landscaping of New Dwelling Houses and Replacement Dwellings in Rural Areas. Section 5.6 Environmental and Site Suitability Requirements. Section 14.8 Landscape Character Assessment of County Cork. Objective GI 14-9: Landscape. Objective GI14-15: Development on the Approach to Towns and Villages. Objective BE 15-6: Biodiversity and New Development. Objective RP5-24: Ribbon Development.
- The matter of sightlines at the proposed vehicular entrance was raised. The report of the Planning Officer was highlighted in relation to the vehicular entrance, it stated the recent proposal was deemed acceptable with sightlines improved through modifying the existing trees/hedges to the west. Revisions to same will be required to improve this issue. The appellant states that there was no revision to the sightlines to the west and that a letter of consent from the landowner was not provided.

- The appellant states that the matter of sightlines at the proposed entrance has not been satisfactorily addressed and that a footpath along the northern roadside boundary should have been provided.
- The appellant contends that the Planning Authority did not take into account the following polices of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, HE 16-21: Design and Landscaping of New Buildings, Section 3.15.1 which refers to Ladysbridge -Vision, County Development Plan Objective DB-01: Development Boundary Objectives for Ladysbridge, Section 14.8 Landscape Character Assessment of County Cork. Objective GI 14-9: Landscape. Objective GI14-15: Development on the Approach to Towns and Villages. Objective BE 15-6: Biodiversity and New Development. Objective RP5-24: Ribbon Development and Objective RP5-22: Design and Landscaping of New Dwelling Houses and Replacement Dwellings in Rural Areas.

6.2. Applicant Response

A response to the third party appeals was received from Declan Behan on behalf of the applicant William Kenneally. The issues raised are as follows:

- Prior to the making of the application Mr. Behan contacted the Area Planner to determine the status of the subject lands and whether residential development would be acceptable for the site. They were advised that the site was within the residential zone of Ladysbridge.
- In relation to planning application references Reg Ref. 24/5729, Reg Ref. 24/5865 and Reg Ref. 24/5866 they refer to standalone sites with separate accesses to each of the sites off the R633 with each site having its own wastewater treatment unit. The design included parking and landscaped embankments. The applications were assessed and the Planning Authority issued further information request on each covering 8 issues.
- Therefore, having considered each application and the requirements from each request for further information it was decided that it would be appropriate to withdraw those applications and submit a new application for the three sites and addressing all the points outlined in the original request for further information.

- The appeals make reference to those applications even though they were withdrawn.
- Under the current application Reg. Ref. 5/4251 permission is sought for the three sites together along with all associated site works and wastewater treatment details. The house design chosen is two-storey with split level aspect so that it would reduce the amount of cut and fill required for the sites and that it would improve the appearance.
- The Planning Authority sought further information on a number of issues referring to the siting and design of the proposed dwellings in relation to the elevated nature of the site, the provision of sightlines to the west of the proposed vehicular entrance and the management of increased surface water runoff from the site.
- Mr. Behan stated that he contacted the Area Planner in relation to the issues raised. The revised proposals have resulted in the three dwellings being situated further north on the site by approximately 1.2m due to separation distance constraints. One access/egress is proposed to serve the dwellings along with an internal access road. Revised finished floor levels are proposed to each dwelling to achieve a more balanced cut and fill approach for the site. The proposed vehicular entrance has been relocated further east, the sightlines avoid neighbouring trees/hedges by 345mm. It is stated that any required trimming can be accommodated on the site.
- The revised plans show Aco channels and soakaways at the main entrance as well as along the main roadway on the site and at each of the individual entrances off this main entrance roadway to eliminate the surface water runoff.
- A clarification of further information was sought in relation to surface water drainage proposals. Mr. Behan states that he spoke to the Area Engineer to get clarification on what was required. In response the following was proposed. Aco drains omitted along the main access roadway and replaced with concrete haunch with gullies draining to soakaways to collect runoff coming from the main access road. Concrete haunches at each individual dwelling entrance with gullies draining to soakaways to collect runoff coming

from the individual driveways. The driveways will be constructed with crushed gravel or permeable paving. Permeable paving is proposed at the main entrance with concrete haunch situated between new entrance pillars with gullies draining to soakaways to pick up runoff from individual driveways.

- The issue of a letter of consent regarding tree trimming on adjacent lands outside the applicant's ownership seems to be a cause of confusion for the two appellants. The proposed revised site entrance achieves the required sightlines without having to access the neighbouring landowner's trees. It is highlighted that the Planning Authority were satisfied with the revised proposals.
- In conclusion it is stated that the proposed scheme is in compliance with all the requirements outlined by the Planning Authority in their request for further information. The site layout and design of the houses have been carefully considered and it is submitted that the proposal will integrate into the area and that it will not adversely impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

6.3. Planning Authority Response

- The Planning Authority is of the opinion that all the relevant issues have been covered in the technical reports already forwarded to the Board as part of the appeal documentation and has no further comment to make on this matter.

6.4. Further Responses

6.4.1. A further response was received from the appellant Colm Hayes on the 13/10/2025. The submission reiterates the points raised in their grounds of appeal and a number of additional matters.

- Concern is expressed that the proposed dwellings would cause overlooking and overshadowing of the properties no's 4, 5 and 6 Na Banta.
- Road safety concerns are raised.
- The issue of flooding is raised. Concern is expressed that the proposed development will generate additional surface water run-off. It is highlighted in

the submission that flooding occurred in Ladysbridge in 2017 and 2023. It is stated that the flood risk assessment does not reflect the recent flooding.

7.0 Assessment

Having examined the application details and all other documents on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and having inspected the site, and having regard to the relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered is as follows:

- Compliance with the Development Plan
- Residential and visual amenity
- Vehicular access and traffic
- Surface water drainage and flood risk
- Other issues

7.1. Compliance with the Development plan

- 7.1.1. The appeal site which is located on the eastern side of the village lies within the defined development boundary of the village of Ladysbridge as set out in Section 3.15 of Volume Four of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 which refers to Ladysbridge.
- 7.1.2. The grounds of appeal refer to Development Boundary Objective DB-01 which states it is an objective 'within the development boundary of Ladysbridge to encourage the development of up to 40 houses during the plan period.' It is set out in the appeals that the number of houses which have been built or granted permission since the adoption of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 exceeds 40. They refer to an application made under Reg. Ref. 24/4857 where permission was sought for the development of 26 no. dwellings at Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge. It is stated in the grounds of appeal that the application was withdrawn when it was highlighted that the estate would have 45 no. houses, if permission was granted for the 26 no. dwellings. The appeals also refer to 32 no. dwellings which were

developed in Pairc an Chosain and 19 no. dwellings that are under development in Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge. Therefore, it is set out in the grounds of appeal that since the Development Plan was adopted that 51 no. dwellings have been developed in Ladysbrige with the possible addition of a further 10 no. dwellings under Reg. Ref. 25/5079 at Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge.

- 7.1.3. In relation to the principle of development, the report of the Planning Officer dated 14/4/2025 noted the site is located within the development boundary of Ladysbridge and that Objective DB-01 seeks to encourage the development of up to 40 houses within the development boundary during the plan period. Regarding the planning applications and housing referred to in the appeals, under Reg. Ref. 20/6881 & ABP 310585-21 permission was granted for the construction of 32 no. houses at Rathcallan, Laydsbridge, Co. Cork. The scheme has been built, and the estate is named Pairc an Chosain. I note that the permission was granted prior to the adoption of the Cork County Development Plan in 2022. Under Reg. Ref. 20/5016 20 no. dwellings were granted permission at Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge and under Reg. Ref. 23/5433 permission was granted for construction of 9 no. dwellings (change of site layout, house type and decrease in housing density from that granted under PI. Reg. No. 20/5016 at 7-15 Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge. I note that the parent permission was granted prior to the adoption of the Cork County Development Plan in 2022.
- 7.1.4. Under Reg. Ref. 25/5079 permission was granted on the 17th of December 2025 for the construction of 10 No. dwellings at Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge. This scheme is an extension of housing estate granted under Planning Reg. No.'s 20/5016 & 23/5433. Therefore, in relation to the argument made in the appeals that the 40 houses within the development boundary of Ladysbridge has been exceeded, I would note that the housing schemes at Pairc an Chosain and Ardchriocha, Dromadda Beg, Ladysbridge were granted permission prior to the adoption of the Cork County Development Plan in 2022 and therefore would have been factored into the permitted housing in Laydsbridge. On that basis I would not concur with the assertion that the 40 houses referred to in Objective DB-01 has been exceeded.
- 7.1.5. The grounds of appeal refer to a number of development plan policies and objectives which they state should have been considered by the Planning Authority in their assessment of the application. Having regard to the location of the site within the

development boundary of the designated village of Ladysbridge the following policies and development plan objectives raised by the appellants and referring to rural locations are not relevant or applicable to the assessment of the proposal County Development Plan Objective RP 5-22: Design and Landscaping of New Dwelling Houses and Replacement Dwellings in Rural Areas, Section 14.8 which refers to Landscape Character Assessment of County Cork and County Development Plan Objective GI14:9 Landscape and County Development Plan Objective RP5-24 Ribbon Development.

7.2. Residential and visual amenity

- 7.2.1. The grounds of appeal raised the potential impact on residential amenity referring to overlooking and overshadowing. The visual impact of the proposed development is raised in terms of the siting and design of the dwellings.
- 7.2.2. Overlooking and overshadowing of the properties to the north in the Na Banta housing estate (no's 4-6) is raised in the further response from the appellant. Na Banta housing estate is located to the north of the appeal site on the opposite side of the R633. The front of the properties no's 1-6 Na Banta face south and address the estate entrance and R633. In relation to the matter of overlooking, I note that a separation distance in excess of 50m is provided between the front of the properties in Na Banta and the proposed dwellings at the closest point. Having regard to the separation distance provided and the orientation of the existing and proposed dwellings I am satisfied that no undue overlooking would arise and there would be no overlooking of private amenity areas.
- 7.2.3. Regarding the matter of overshadowing having regard to the separation distance provided, of over 50m between the proposed dwellings and the existing properties to the north and the two-storey design of the dwellings, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not give rise to any undue overshadowing.
- 7.2.4. The grounds of appeal raised the issue of impact on visual amenity. It is contended in the appeals that the design of the proposed dwellings is out of character with surrounding development. It is submitted that the proposed three dwellings are which are of two-storey design rather than bungalows and with a proposed white rendered finish do not respect the character, pattern or tradition of existing places. The issue

of the ridge height of the proposed dwellings is raised. It is stated in the grounds of appeal that the proposed development will break the ridgelines of houses to the east and west of the site.

- 7.2.5. In response to the matter the applicant's agent has stated that the house design chosen is two-storey with split level aspect so that it would reduce the amount of cut and fill required for the sites and that it would improve the appearance. As illustrated on the Proposed Elevations, Drawing no. DR-A-4000 P01 the front elevation of the dwellings is two storey with a height of 7.6m with the rear elevations being single storey with a height of 4.8m. This design approach is based on the topography of the site and is appropriate having regard to the sloping nature of the site. I note that the housing in the na Banta Housing Estate is a mix of two-storey and three-storey dormer properties. Accordingly, I would therefore not agree with the appellants that the proposed dwellings are out of character with surrounding development within Ladysbridge. Having regard to the siting and design of the proposed dwellings, I am satisfied that they will integrate into the site and streetscape.

7.3. Vehicular access and traffic

- 7.3.1. The grounds of appeal raised the proposed vehicular access arrangements and the level of traffic which the proposed development would generate.
- 7.3.2. The site is served by an existing gated agricultural entrance on the R633. The scheme as originally proposed included three separate vehicular entrances to serve the three proposed dwelling. As part of the further information requested, the applicant was required to address the matter of the proposed vehicular entrance design and sightlines. It was advised in the further information that they may wish to consider the entrance arrangement and that a single entrance may be more beneficial in terms of reducing the level of hardstanding/platforming required to accommodate the proposed development. In relation to the sightlines at the entrances as originally proposed the further information advised that the trees/hedges located immediately to the west of the site entrance inhibits sightlines in that direction and would therefore need to be reduced to 1m in height above the road level and that a letter of consent from the landowner would be required.

- 7.3.3. Revised plans were submitted to the Planning Authority on the 21st of May including the Proposed Site Layout Plan Drawing No. DR-A-10002 P02 which indicates a single vehicular entrance to the western side of the site to serve the proposed three dwellings with an internal access road. The applicant's agent confirms in the appeal response that the proposed vehicular entrance has been relocated further east and that the sightlines avoid neighbouring trees/hedges by 345mm. They note therefore that there would be no requirement for trees/hedges on the adjoining lands to the west to be removed, cut or trimmed.
- 7.3.4. In relation to the proposed sightlines, I note the 'Design Manual for Urban Road and Street' (DMURS) (May 2019) specifies sight distances for urban roads within a speed limit of up to 60km/hr. Table 4.2 of DMURS provides Stopping Sight Distances (SSD) for urban road. The speed limit on the R633 (Ballymacoda road) along the location where the vehicular entrance is proposed is 50km/hr. The road signage to this effect is located approximately 90m the east of the proposed vehicular entrance. Based on the SSD set out in Table 4.2 of DMURS 45m would be required for the R633 with a design speed of 50km/hr. As indicated on the Proposed Site Layout Plan Drawing No. DR-A-10002 P02 sightlines of 70m are proposed to the east and west of the site entrance. Accordingly, the sightlines proposed are in excess of the distance required under Table 4.2 of DMURS. Furthermore, I note the report of the Area Engineer dated 8th of September 2025 which stated that the revised vehicular entrance layout and sightlines are satisfactory.
- 7.3.5. Regarding the level of traffic which the scheme would generate once built and occupied, the proposal is a small-scale residential scheme of 3 no. dwellings. The proposed layout provides for the on-site parking of cars to the front and side of each dwelling with the area provided having the capacity to accommodate two car parking spaces per dwelling, therefore having regard to the scale of the scheme it will generate a relatively low level of new traffic onto the existing local network. The appeals raised concern that a footpath was not proposed along the roadside boundary. I note that the provision of a footpath was raised by the Planning Authority in the further information. The scheme as permitted does not include a footpath along the roadside. I would consider given the location of the site close to the boundary of the village and the limited scale of the development, that it would be acceptable that a footpath is not provide.

7.3.6. In relation to the proposed vehicular arrangements I note that the Area Engineer raised no concerns in relation to the level of traffic that the proposal would generate, and I note their report dated 8th of September 2025 which confirmed that following the submission of a response to further information that there were no objections to the proposal subject to the attachment of conditions.

7.4. **Surface water drainage and flood risk**

7.4.1. The surface water drainage and flood risk is raised by the appellants.

7.4.2. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was submitted with the application. The site is located within Flood Zone A. On the basis that the site is located within Flood Zone A and the proposed residential development is classified as 'vulnerable', a justification test is required in accordance with the provisions of 'The Planning System and Flood Risk Management - Guidelines for Planning Authorities.' The land is zoned for development under the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 it satisfies criteria 1 of the justification test. In relation to criteria 2 (i) of the guidelines, it is stated in the FRA that the proposed development will not affect the conveyance around the site and in relation to surface water all stormwater generated on the site will be attenuated. Therefore, it is set out in the FRA that the proposed development would not increase the flood risk elsewhere. In relation to criteria 2 (ii) of the guidelines it is stated in the FRA that the finished floor level of the proposed dwellings are +10.65m OD which is above the flood protection level. It is also proposed to provide a Flood Awareness Plan. Therefore, it is set out in the FRA that the proposed development satisfies the criteria of 2(ii) of the justification test. In relation to criteria 2 (iii) of the guidelines it is set out in the FRA that the proposed development satisfies the criteria which requires measures to ensure that residual risk to the area of development will be managed on the basis that a Flood Awareness Plan will be developed for residents. In relation to criteria 2 (iv) of the guidelines it specifies that development shall achieve the wider planning objectives in relation to development of good urban design and vibrant and active streetscapes. It is set out in the FRA that the proposed development has satisfied the criteria of part 1 and 2 of the Justification test and that it is in accordance with the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028.

- 7.4.3. The Planning Authority as part the further information required that the applicant outline proposals to manage increased surface water runoff from the site due to the increase in hardstanding areas. This included proposals to prevent flooding onto the public road.
- 7.4.4. In response the applicant submitted revised surface water drainage proposals. The report of the Area Engineer dated 10/6/2025 recommended that clarification be sought on the basis that they required the surface water drainage proposals to be designed to cater for the steepness of the site and to prevent any surface water from leaving the site and adding to the public road drainage.
- 7.4.5. The first party response to the appeal outlined the proposals submitted at clarification stage following conversations with the Area Engineer. They confirmed that the Aco drains which were previously proposed were omitted along the main access roadway and replaced with concrete haunch with gullies draining to soakaways to collect runoff coming from the main access road. Concrete haunches were proposed at each individual dwelling entrance with gullies draining to soakaways to collect runoff coming from the individual driveways. It is proposed that driveways will be constructed with crushed gravel or permeable paving and that permeable paving is proposed at the main entrance. Gullies are proposed to drain to soakaways to pick up runoff from individual driveways.
- 7.4.6. Area Engineer in their report dated 8/9/2025 stated that the drainage proposals were sufficient and satisfied part 2 of the Justification Test. The report concluded that the Flood Risk Assessment was satisfactory and took sufficient account of downstream effects and future scenarios in the design of drainage. The Area Engineer had no objection subject to the attachment of conditions.
- 7.4.7. Having regard to the revised proposals to accommodate surface water generated within the scheme on site including with soakaways, permeable paving and measures including the collection of surface water in gullies to drain to soakaways, I am satisfied that surface water generated on the site will not result in surface water flooding onto the adjoining public road or surrounding properties notwithstanding the elevated nature of the site. Furthermore, having regard to the contents of the Flood Risk Assessment I am satisfied that the proposed development will not give rise to any undue flood risk.

7.5. Other issues

- 7.5.1. The appeals reference the matter of the date of the erection of the site notice on the site and the details provided on the application form. In relation to the site notice, I would note that the Planning Authority were satisfied that the site notice was erected in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Regulations, 2001 (as amended).
- 7.5.2. It is stated in the appeals that part 4.4 of the planning application form was not correctly answered. It states, “do you own any of the land which adjoins, abuts or is adjacent to the site.” The answer provided was no. It was highlighted in the appeals that as indicated on the Site Layout, Drawing no. DR-A-10002 P01 and Proposed Overall Site Layout Plan, Drawing no. DR-A-10002 P01, the adjoining property to the west is owned by the applicant. Having reviewed the drawings I note that the referenced adjacent site is outlined in blue on both drawings signifying the applicants’ ownership of the property. Accordingly, while I would note the matter, I would consider that it is not of material significance to the assessment of the proposed development.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.
- 8.1.2. The subject site is located approximately 5km from Ballycotton SPA (Site Code 004022) which is situated to the south-east. Ballymacoda (Clonpriest and Pillmore) SAC (Site Code 000077) is located approximately 6.5km to the east of the appeal site. Ballymacoda (Clonpriest and Pillmore) SPA (Site Code 004023) is located circa 7.4km to the east of the appeal site. Cork Harbour SPA (Site Code 004030) is located approximately 9.6km to the south-west of the appeal site. Great Island Channel SAC (Site Code 001058) is located approximately 8.7km to the west of the appeal site.
- 8.1.3. The proposed development comprises the construction of three dwellings and associated site works which includes the installation of three on-site wastewater effluent treatment system on a 0.281-hectare site.

- 8.1.4. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal in relation to species of qualifying interest within the Natura 2000 sites in relative proximity to the appeal site.
- 8.1.5. No streams/watercourses are identified on site.
- 8.1.6. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature of the development proposed which are located on serviced lands
 - The distance to the nearest European sites, and the absence of any hydrological or other pathways
 - Taking into account the screening report by the Planning Authority
- 8.1.7. 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.
- 8.1.8. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, is not required.

9.0 Water Framework Directive

- 9.1. The proposed development has been subject to a screening for Water Framework Directive Assessment (refer to Appendix 3 of this report).
- 9.2. The subject site is located to the eastern side of the village of Ladysbridge, Co. Cork. The site comprises a greenfield which is located at a low elevation of approximately 30m contour. The soil type is AminDW – deep well drained mineral soil derived from mainly acidic parent materials. The subsoil is Devonian sandstone till. The bedrock is Tournaisian sandstone, mudstone and limestone. The womanagh River (WOMANAGH_20) is situated to the north and west, it lies circa 198m to the west at the closest point. Ballycotton Bay coastal waterbody (IE_SW_040_0000) is located 5km to the south. The Knockadoon East (IE_SW_G_045) groundwater body underlies the site.

- 9.3. The proposed development comprises the construction of three detached single storey houses, private domestic garages, new vehicular entrance, three on-site wastewater treatment systems and associated site works.
- 9.4. No water deterioration concerns were raised in the appeal.
- 9.5. 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.
- 9.6. I have assessed the proposed construction of three detached single storey house, private domestic garage, new vehicular entrance, three on-site wastewater treatment systems and associated site works.
- 9.7. I 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.
- 9.8. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- The nature and scale of the development
The proposed tertiary treatment of on-site effluent.

Conclusion

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. I recommend that permission be granted.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. Having regard to the location of the site within the development boundary the village of Ladysbridge as set out in Section 3.15 of Volume Four of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 which refers to Ladysbridge, the pattern of development in the area and to the nature, form and design of the proposed development, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the residential or visual amenities of the area, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience and would have no adverse impact in terms of surface water disposal or foul drainage and would not increase flood risk in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

12.0 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 21st day of May 2025 and the 9th day of July 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.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

Reason: In the interest of public health and surface water management.

3. Prior to the commencement of development the developer shall enter into a Connection Agreements with Uisce Éireann (Irish Water) to provide for service connections to the public water supply.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure adequate water facilities.

4. Foul drainage shall be by means of proprietary wastewater treatment systems. The treatment units and percolation areas shall meet all the requirements of the Code of Practice, Wastewater Treatment Disposal Systems Serving Single Houses (p.e. < 10) EPA 2021 and shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the manufacturers instructions.

Reason: In the interest of public health.

5.
 - (a) The entrance gates to the proposed development shall be set back not less than four metres and not more than six metres from the edge of the public road. Wing walls forming the entrance shall be splayed at an angle of not less than 45 degrees and shall not exceed one metre in height.
 - (b) The existing front boundary hedge shall be retained except to the extent that its removal is necessary to provide for the entrance to the site.

Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.

6. Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed dwellings 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.

7. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1900 Mondays to Friday inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.

8. All service cables associated with the proposed development such as electrical, telecommunications and communal television shall be located underground. Ducting shall be provided by the developer to facilitate the provision of broadband infrastructure within the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

9. 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 Coimisiún 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.

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

3rd of February 2026

Form 1 – EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ACP 323754-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of three dwellings and associated site works, which includes the installation of three on-site wastewater effluent treatment system on a 0.281-hectare site.
Development Address	Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork.
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
<p>4. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a ‘project’ for the purposes of EIA?</p> <p>(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)</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a ‘Project’. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<p>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) construction of more than 500 dwellings
<input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<p>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?</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed	

<p>type of proposed road 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>Part 2, Class 10(b)(i) construction of more than 500 dwellings</p> <p>- The proposed development is below the 500 dwelling threshold. The proposed development is for the construction of 3 no. dwelling units.</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 323754-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of three dwellings and associated site works, which includes the installation of three on-site wastewater effluent treatment system on a 0.281-hectare site.
Development Address	Knockglass, Ladysbridge, 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).	The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project. It does not require the use of substantial natural resources or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks 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).	The development is removed from sensitive natural habitats, centres of population and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan. There are no protected species/habitats on 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 modest nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of 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.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3 – Water Framework Directive Screening

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	323754-25	Townland, address	Knockglass, Ladysbridge, Co. Cork
Description of project		Construction of three detached single storey houses, private domestic garages, new vehicular entrance, three on-site wastewater treatment systems and associated site works.	
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,		The site comprises a greenfield which is located at a low elevation of approximately 30m contour. The soil type is AminDW – deep well drained mineral soil derived from mainly acidic parent materials. The subsoil is Devonian sandstone till. The bedrock is Tournaisian sandstone, mudstone and limestone. The womanagh River (WOMANAGH_20) is situated to the north and west, it lies circa 198m to the west at the closest point. Ballycotton Bay coastal waterbody (IE_SW_040_0000) is located 5km to the south. The Knockadoon East (IE_SW_G_045) groundwater body underlies the site.	
Proposed surface water details		Soak aways proposed	
Proposed water supply source & available capacity		Uisce Éireann mains water connection – no capacity issues	

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Tertiary Treatment Systems with gravity feed to the treatment plants and pumped feed to Peat Modules with to discharge to Ground Water with a PE of 6 are proposed.				
Others?		No				
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 run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Waterbody	198m	Womanagh River (WOMANAGH_20) IE_SW_19W011300	Moderate	At risk	Agriculture and urban wastewater	Not hydrologically connected to river
Coastal Waterbody	5km	Ballycotton Bay (IE_SW_040_0000)	Good	Not at risk	-	Not hydrologically connected to the coastal waterbody

Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying Site	Knockadoon East (IE_SW_G_045)	Good	Not at risk	-	Free draining soil conditions	
<p>Step 4: 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.</p>							
<p>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</p>							
No.	Component	Water body 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.
1.	Site clearance/Construction	Womanagh River (WOMANAGH_20) IE_SW_19W0 11300	Existing drainage ditches, watercourse	Siltation, pH (concrete), hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction practice	No	Screened out
<p>OPERATIONAL PHASE</p>							

2.	Discharges to Ground	Knockadoon East (IE_SW_G_045)	Pathway exists	Treated effluent to discharge to groundwater	Tertiary Effluent Treatment systems	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
3.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA