



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report PL-500060-CE

---

<b>Development</b>	<b>House and garage and all associated site works.</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Ballyvoe, Doolin , Co Clare</b>
<b>Planning Authority</b>	<b>Clare County Council</b>
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	<b>25207</b>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	<b>Marian McDonagh &amp; Colin O'Donoghue</b>
<b>Type of Application</b>	<b>Permission</b>
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	<b>Grant Permission + Conditions</b>
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	<b>Third Party Normal Planning Appeal</b>
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	<b>Michael Queally</b>
<b>Observer(s)</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> December 2025</b>
<b>Inspector</b>	<b>Ciara McGuinness</b>

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site is located in the townland of Ballyvoe, approx. 1.5km to the north of Doolin. Access to the site is from the L1036 Local Road. The junction of the L1036 with the R479, which is a Scenic Route, is c.440m to the west of the site. The site is located c.90m to the east of the Knockfin Cluster, with a number of rural dwellings in the area clustered around the Church, which is located at the corner of the junction between the R479 and L1036. The site is bound to the east, west and the north by agricultural lands.
- 1.2. The site is rectangular in shape and extends over an area of 0.22 hectares. The site has frontage onto the local road to the south. The site rises away from the road at a moderate gradient with a level difference of c.3m from the road edge (+97.7m) to the rear of the site (+101m). The site currently comprises agricultural lands. The front boundary comprises a dry-stone wall. Neither the eastern nor western boundaries of the site are delineated.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a dwelling house, proprietary wastewater treatment system and all associated works. The proposed single storey house has a stated floor area of 128sqm and a maximum ridge height of 5.075m.
- 2.2. The dwelling is sited towards the northern portion of the site, at a relatively high level within the site. The Planning Authority requested further information highlighting concerns with regards to the elevated positioning of the proposed dwelling. Revised plans were submitted with the dwelling moving southwards on the site (towards the front of the site) to a lower contour. The proposed dwelling has moved forward within the site by c.13m, and the FFL level has been reduced from 100.475m to 100.25m.
- 2.3. The vehicular entrance proposed to serve the site is located approximately midway along the southern boundary of the site. The proposed wastewater treatment system is located in the southeastern corner of the site, to the front of the house.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

The Planning Authority granted permission on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of September 2025 subject to 11 no. conditions. Conditions were of a standard nature.

Condition 2 - requires the dwelling to be occupied as the permanent place of residence by the applicant for a minimum period of 7 years.

Condition 3 – requires the finished floor level of the dwelling to be 100m. Revised drawings shall be submitted and agreed with the Planning Authority.

Condition 4 – requires the existing boundary to be retained except where its removal is required for the construction of an entrance. Entrance gate shall be recessed 2.4m inside the line of the existing road boundary with wing walls not more than 1.1m in height splayed at an angle of 45 degrees or bell mouthed to give an entrance width of 13.5m.

Condition 5 - relates to the installation and maintenance of the WWTS.

Condition 6 – requires that surface water is prevented from running onto the public road by provision of a concrete channel or a concrete grid with sump drained to the local drain or soakaway.

Condition 7 - relates to the external finishes to be used.

Condition 8 requires cables to be located underground.

Condition 9 – requires the eastern, western and northern boundaries of the site to be planted with a line of native hedgerow species. Any planting that is diseased or fails within 2 years of planting shall be replaced.

Condition 10 - prohibits the garage from being used for habitation or commercial activity.

Condition 11 - relates to the financial contribution required.

### **3.2. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.2.1. Planning Reports**

The Planners Report dated (15/08/2025) notes that the subject site is elevated above the public road and that it has uninterrupted long-range views to the south and west towards the scenic route and further towards the coastline. While the dwelling is not considered excessive in height it is proposed to be located towards the rear of the site on the higher contour. Objective CDP 14.2 requires selection of appropriate sites in the first instance, together with consideration of the details of siting and design directed towards minimising visual impacts. It is also a requirement that the site has been selected to avoid visually prominent locations.

A land registry search has shown that there are other parcels of land falling within the folio which the applicant has not declared. Further information is requested in this regard as the proposed development does not comply with the provisions of Objective CDP 14.2.

A summary of the Further Information request is outlined below;

- Details of other locations/land parcels map and associated folio numbers of all parcels of land under your ownership which were considered for development and the reason why each one was discounted
- A detailed justification for why the subject site was selected for development
- A revised layout plan such that the dwelling is moved southwards on site (towards the front of the site) to a lower contour.

A subsequent Planners Report Dated (22/09/2025) notes that the folio maps submitted are the same as the one submitted originally comprising 7.14ha (CE22518). A land registry search showed that the applicant owns other lands in Glasha which are by the coast and relatively inaccessible. It was noted that there are lower lands on the south side of the road from the proposed development, however the character of the landscape is very open and exposed and may be more visually conspicuous in setting, albeit more low lying.

The distance of the proposed dwelling has been brought forward on the site from an original set back distance of 41m from the public road to approximately 29m from the public road. The FFL level has been reduced from 100.47m to 100.25m. It is considered that the FFL level should be reduced further to 100m and this matter can be dealt with by condition. A grant of permission is recommended.

### 3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Environment Section – The proposed system is suitably designed to provide adequate treatment of the discharge from this dwelling. Attachment of standard condition in relation to installation and maintenance of system is recommended.

West Clare Municipal District – Condition recommended in relation to the control of surface water.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

One third party observation was received from the appellant, Michael Queally. It is contended that the application is premature until such time as appropriately zoned sites available to applicant are assessed in line with current planning guidelines.

Traffic safety issues are also raised.

A representation from Cllr Joe Garrihy was noted on the file.

## 4.0 Planning History

None.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Clare County Development Plan 2023-2029

- 5.1.1. Section 4.2.6 of the Clare County Development Plan 2023-2029 deals with Single Houses in the Countryside. It states that *“the Council will ensure that development of the open countryside takes place in a manner that is compatible with the policy objectives of the NPF and the RSES, whilst ensuring the protection of key economic, environmental, biodiversity and cultural / heritage assets such as the road network, water quality and important landscapes.”*

5.1.2. The site is situated in a rural area under strong urban influence as identified on Map H3 of the County Development Plan. In these areas, the key objectives of the Council are:

a) To facilitate the genuine housing requirements of persons with a demonstrable economic or social need to live in these rural areas.

b) To direct urban-generated development to areas zoned for new housing development in the adjoining urban centres, towns, villages and clusters as identified in the County Settlement Strategy and to seek to enhance the vitality and viability of these settlements.

5.1.3. The following objectives are also considered relevant to the subject site;

**Development Plan Objective: Settled Landscapes CDP14.2** It is an objective of Clare County Council: To permit development in areas designated as 'settled landscapes' to sustain and enhance quality of life and residential amenity and promote economic activity subject to:

- I. Conformity with all other relevant provisions of the Plan and the availability and protection of resources;
- II. Selection of appropriate sites in the first instance within this landscape, together with consideration of the details of siting and design which are directed towards minimising visual impacts;
- III. Regard being had to the need to avoid intrusion on scenic routes and on ridges or shorelines.

Developments in these areas will be required to demonstrate:-

- a) That the site has been selected to avoid visual prominence
- b) That the site layouts avail of existing topography and vegetation to reduce visibility from scenic routes, walking trails, water bodies, public amenities and roads.
- c) That design of buildings and structures reduces visual impact through careful choice of forms, finishes and colours, and that any site works seek to reduce visual impact.

**Development Plan Objective: Scenic Routes CDP14.7** It is an objective of Clare County Council:

- a) To protect sensitive areas from inappropriate development while providing for development and change that will benefit the rural community;
- b) To ensure that proposed developments take into consideration their effects on views from the public road towards scenic features or areas and are designed and located to minimise their impact; and
- c) To ensure that appropriate standards of location, siting, design, finishing and landscaping are achieved.

**Development Plan Objective: Countryside CDP 4.10** It is an objective of Clare County Council: To ensure that the countryside continues to play its role as a place to live, work, recreate and visit, having careful regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements, the carrying capacity of the countryside, siting and design issues and environmental sensitivities.

**Development Plan Objective: New Single Houses in the Countryside within the 'Areas of Special Control' CDP 4.14** It is an objective of Clare County Council:

- i. In the parts of the countryside within the 'Areas of Special Control' i.e.:
  - Areas Under Strong Urban Influence
  - Heritage Landscapes
  - Sites accessed from or abutting Scenic Routes

To permit a new single house for the permanent occupation of an applicant who meets the necessary criteria as set out in the following categories. (Category A – Economic Need and Category B – Social Need)

- ii. To ensure compliance with all relevant environmental legislation as outlined in Objective CDP3.1 and to have regard to the County Clare House Design Guide, with respect to siting and boundary treatments.

The policy goes on to provide a definition for 'Economic Need' and 'Social Need'.

## 5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

Black Head-Poulsallagh Complex SAC – c.1.5km to the west of the site

Black Head-Poulsallagh Complex pNHA – c.1.5km to the west of the site

### 5.3. EIA Screening

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

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

The appeal is a third-party appeal by Michael Queally against the Planning Authority's decision to grant permission. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows;

- Omission of relevant landholdings by the applicant created a misleading impression that the site at Ballyvoe was the applicant's only viable option.
- A summary of the applicants land holding is provided;
  - Folio CE9116F lies within the settlement of Doolin and is zoned "Mixed Use". By definition this location is more consistent with CDP objectives to consolidate development within settlements.
  - Folio CE22211 situated alongside the zoned land provides further scope for a dwelling in a contextually suitable location, benefiting from proximity to existing settlement fabric and representing a significantly less intrusive option than the exposed site in Ballyvoe.
  - Folio CE13021 is more secluded and in a less visually prominent position than the site in Ballyvoe.
- By withholding these folios, the applicant prevented the Planning Authority from properly applying its own policies specifically in relation to Objective CDP 14.2

## 6.2. Applicant Response

The applicant's response to the grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows;

- The applicant misinterpreted the request from the Planning Authority. The other lands owned by the applicant but not disclosed are not available or suitable for development of a domestic house for the following reasons;
  - CE9116F – With an area of 0.17ha is too small for development. The road is often impassable due to parking of cars and buses
  - CE22211 – The folio is known locally as 'Mine Hill' as it was historically an area of Phosphate and Flourspar mining and is elevated above all the surrounding dwelling houses. The presence of mines makes it unsuitable for development and its elevated nature would lead to the development making a significant impact on the surrounding landscape.
  - CE13021 – The lands are accessed by a right of way over the neighbour's lands and have no frontage. A large area of the lands run adjacent to the river and are planted with forestry.
- Ballyvoe would remain the only location with sufficient site area available, minimum impact on the landscape, suitable percolation conditions, proximity to other houses and existing farmyard, adequate road frontage and sightlines.

## 6.3. Planning Authority Response

The Planning Authority's response can be summarised as follows;

### Title

The Planning Authority had no reason to raise doubt as to the bona fides of the further information received regarding the extent of landownership of the applicant. Section 5.13 'Issues relating to Title to Land' of the Development Management Guidelines (2007) does not specifically address issues regarding non-disclosure of extent of title and refers mostly to the issue of dispute regarding title and sufficient legal interest. The Planning Authority has not been circulated with the first party's observations and to speculate regarding ownership would not be appropriate.

### Traffic Safety

A report from West Clare MDO was received after the Planner's Report was completed and signed. No concerns were raised about availability of sight distance. The only issues raised related to the drainage of surface water which can be dealt with by condition.

### Landscape and Visual Impact

The comments regarding visual impact are noted. This aspect of the application was assessed on the understanding that this parcel was the only one available to the applicant.

## **6.4. Observations**

None.

## **6.5. Further Responses**

A further response was received from the appellant, Michael Queally. The response considers the central issue is the decision was based on the false premise that no other land was available. It is noted that Council do not request that the decision is upheld. It is also considered that traffic safety concerns remain unresolved with no written Roads Section assessment on file.

## **7.0 Assessment**

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

- Amenities of the Rural Area
- Traffic

### **7.2. Amenities of the Rural Area**

7.2.1. As is apparent in the planning authority assessment, the third-party submission, and the grounds of the appeal case, a key issue raised relates to the site selection and

the impact of the proposed development on the rural character and the amenities of this rural location.

- 7.2.2. The subject site is located within a rural area that is within a 'Settled Landscape'. As per the requirements of Objective CDP14.2, development is permissible in a Settled Landscapes subject to selection of appropriate sites in the first instance, together with consideration of the details of siting and design which are directed towards minimising visual impacts. It is also a requirement to avoid intrusion on scenic routes and on ridges or shorelines. I note that there is a scenic route c.440m to the west of the site, however given the separation distance and intervening land uses, I do not consider that the proposed development would have an impact on the route.
- 7.2.3. The site is located on the northern side of L1036 Local Road. I note from my site visit that views into this field are open and the rising ground levels from the road towards the north of the site can be clearly seen. The site layout plan shows the level on the road outside the site is 97.7m and the level at the rear boundary of the site is 101m. In response to the request for Further Information, I note with the proposed dwelling has moved forward within the site by c.12m and that the FFL level has been reduced from 100.475m to 100.25m. Notwithstanding the applicant's efforts to relocate the dwelling within in the site, I consider that the proposed dwelling is still located in a very elevated part of the landholding. I consider that there is still considerable scope within the site to move the proposed dwelling forward to a much lower contour within the site. The dwelling is still set back 28m from the public road, with a considerable driveway and parking area to the front of the house. In my view, the proposed development would result in an unduly obtrusive feature in the rural landscape due to the siting of the proposed dwelling on an elevated site. I further note the applicant owns land to the east and to the west of the proposed development site and to the south on the opposite side of the road. In my opinion there would also be scope to move the dwelling further to the west. I do not consider that the applicant has given any tangible reasons for not being able to do so.
- 7.2.4. I note the appellant submits that alternative locations exist for the proposed development. The applicants have in turn outlined the full portfolio of lands available to them within the response to the appeal, setting out a brief appraisal of each site's unsuitability for development. The consideration of alternative locations for the proposed dwelling within the wider landholding was not fully explored by the planning

authority, and I consider that there may be planning merit in doing so. In respect of protecting the rural amenity of the area, selecting a site in an alternative location, such as the lands located at Roadford, which are within the settlement boundary of Doolin, would have the added benefits of clustering buildings in the rural landscape, thereby reducing their visual impact on the character of the area. I would note however that each application would be assessed on its own merits and would need to conform with all other relevant provisions of the Development Plan.

7.2.5. Having regard to the development as proposed, I do not consider that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated the siting of the proposed development to be the most suitable and/ or appropriate given the elevational changes within the site. I consider that the siting of the proposed development does not comply with the provisions of Objective CDP 14.2 and that the proposed development would cause injury to the rural character and amenities of the rural area. I do not consider that the changes made by way of Further Information have not gone far enough. I note the Planning Authority have conditioned a further reduction in floor level to 100m. However given the scale of the site, I consider that there is further scope to amend the site layout, with further revisions to the siting of the dwelling, which may in turn require the relocation of the proposed wastewater treatment system.

7.2.6. In conclusion, having regard to the siting of the development on an elevated location within a site in a Settled Landscape, I consider that the proposed development would erode the open character of the countryside at this location and would militate against the preservation of the rural environment. It would also result in serious injury to the visual amenities of the area. Refusal is recommended on this basis.

### 7.3. **Traffic**

7.3.1. The appellant considers that the proposed development would result in a further traffic hazard given the sites location near a dangerous bend and on a heavily trafficked tourist and farm machinery route. The appellant also contends that there is no written assessment from the Roads Section. The Planners Report notes that traffic issues were discussed with the Area Office and the office advised that there are adequate sight distances at the proposed location. A report on file from the Area Office (dated 18/08/2025) does not raise any issues with regards to traffic or

sightlines. A further remail (dated 12/09/2025) confirms that there are no further comments from the Area Office following receipt of Further Information.

7.3.2. I note from my site visit and from my review of the plans, that the proposed development is located along a straight stretch of road. From my observations on site, I did not consider the road to be heavily trafficked. I am satisfied that the sight distances for the proposed access meets the requirements as set out in Section A1.6.2 of the Development Plan with Table A2 requiring a 90m distance on a road with a design speed of 60 km/hr. The addition of the proposed development will add little to the current volumes of traffic on the local road network and I do not agree with the appellants that it presents a safety risk. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of vehicular access and traffic considerations and car parking provision.

## 8.0 **Appropriate Assessment**

I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located c.1.5km from Black Head-Poulsallagh Complex SAC.

The proposed development comprises the development of a single dwelling. Refer to Section 2 of this report for further details.

No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning application/appeal.

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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows insert as relevant:

- Nature of works e.g. small scale and residential nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of connections
- Taking into account screening determination by the PA

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.

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

The subject site is located c.220m to the north of Aille River.

The proposed development comprises construction of a dwelling house.

No water deterioration concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

I have assessed the proposed dwelling and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the 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.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- Nature of works - small scale and nature of the development
- Location-distance from nearest Water bodies and lack of hydrological connections

### 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. I recommend that planning permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 11.0 Reasons and Considerations

1. The site of the proposed development is located within a 'Settled Landscape' as set out in the Clare County Development Plan 2023-2029, where emphasis is placed on the selection of appropriate sites in the first instance within this landscape, together with consideration of the details of siting and design which are directed towards minimising visual impacts. Having regard to the topography of the site, the elevated positioning of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would form a discordant and obtrusive feature on the landscape at this location, would seriously injure the visual amenities of the area, would fail to be adequately absorbed and integrated into the landscape, would militate against the preservation of the rural environment and would set an undesirable precedent for other such prominently located development in the vicinity. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Ciara McGuinness  
23<sup>rd</sup> January 2026

## Appendix 1 - Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500060-CE
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	House and garage and all associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Ballyvoe , Doolin , Co Clare
<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>	
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 1</u>, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in <b>Part 1</b> .  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in <u>Part 2</u>, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8	

<p>of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Class 10(b)(i) construction of more than 500 dwellings</li> <li>- The proposed development is for 1 dwelling and is therefore sub-threshold</li> <li>- Preliminary examination required (Form 2)</li> </ul>

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

## Appendix 2 - Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	PL-500060-CE
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	House and garage and all associated site works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Ballyvoe , Doolin , Co Clare
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<b>Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed.</b>  The nature and size of the development (1 residential unit) is not exceptional in the context of the existing rural environment. The proposed development will not result in the productions of any significant waste, emissions or pollutants. Localised construction impacts will be temporary. The development, by virtue of its type(residential), does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster.
<b>Location of development</b>  (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<b>Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed</b>  The site is located in a rural location. The application site is not proximate to any protected sites. The nearest European site is 1.5km to the west of the site. It is not considered that the proposed development would be likely to have a significant impact on the European site. Given the nature of the development and the site/surroundings, it would not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	<b>Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects.</b>  There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. There is no real likelihood of significant cumulative effects having regard to existing or permitted projects.
<b>Conclusion</b>	

Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.  <b>x</b>
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)