



Inspector's Report

PL-500295-CK-25

Development	Protected Structure: Retention of as built extension to dwelling together with all other ancillary site works.
Location	Maghereen, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork
Planning Authority	Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	255480
Applicant	Milmac Limited
Type of Application	Retention
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant	John White
Observers	None
Date of Site Inspection	28 th January 2026
Inspector	Siobhan Carroll

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	3
4.0	Planning History.....	5
5.0	Policy Context	5
6.0	EIA Screening.....	8
7.0	The Appeal.....	8
8.0	Assessment.....	12
9.0	AA Screening.....	16
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	17
11.0	Recommendation	18
12.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	18
13.0	Conditions	18
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	20

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located at Maghereen, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork. It is situated on the northern side of Mill Lane and circa 700m to the north-west of Macroom, Main Street. Sullane River a tributary of the River Lee lies circa 124m to the east of the appeal site.
- 1.2. Cornmills residential estate, containing 10. no. semi-detached dwellings, is located to the north-east of the appeal site.
- 1.3. The site has a stated area of 0.102 hectares. It contains a detached two-storey dwelling with a floor area of circa 93sq m. The single storey extension, the subject of the application has been constructed to the rear of the dwelling it has an area of 34.78sq m. The site is within the curtilage of a Protected Structure comprising Mill Buildings and Mill Races (RPS 2370). The structures are also a Recorded Monument (CO071-047001) it is described in the 'Archaeological Inventory of Cork (1997) as an abandoned two-storey structure in Massytown, Macroom, named 'Corn Mill' on 1842 OS 6-inch map.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the retention of an as-built extension to the rear (northern) elevation of existing dwelling house together with all other ancillary site works which is in the curtilage of a Protected Structure.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. Cork County Council decided to grant permission for retention of the development by Order dated 22nd of October 2025. The permission is subject to 5 no. conditions.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

- 3.2.1. Planning Reports
- 3.2.2. Further Information was requested in relation to the following;

1. Submit a Method Statement for the removal of the cabling penetrating the wall of the east-west range of RPS ID: 2370 which is part of the applicant's landholding, and which connects to the extension seeking retention. It shall include a method for making good the damaged section of wall with the matching stone and lime mortar with aggregate to match the existing. The cabling may be appropriately re-routed.
 2. Detailed information is required in relation to the potential impact/loading that the extension seeking retention may place on the tailrace of the mill (RPS ID:2370). A full and informative CCTV survey report that includes photographs, an assessment of the condition of the tailrace and its capacity to withstand the load on part of its shall also be provided.
- 3.2.3. Planner's Report: dated 21/10/2025 – A Method Statement has been submitted with the proposed relocation of the oil tank. Photographs from the CCTV survey and an engineer's opinion with regards to potential collapse. The report of the Conservation Officer has no objection to a grant of permission subject conditions. Accordingly, the Planning Officer was satisfied that the matters raised in the further information had been addressed. A grant of permission was recommended.
- 3.2.4. Other Technical Reports
- 3.2.5. Area Engineer: No objections subject to conditions.
- 3.2.6. Conservation Officer: Report dated 4/9/2025 - A request for Further information sought.
- 3.2.7. Conservation Officer: Report dated 15/10/2025 – The Conservation Officer considered that a satisfactory method statement was submitted, that the proposed relocation of the oil tank was acceptable and that the Mill tailrace is not under undue loading as a result of the construction of the extension. A grant of permission was recommended subject to the attachment of conditions.
- 3.2.8. Archaeologist: Report dated 15/10/2025 – The proposed development site is part of a Recorded Archaeological Monument Mill CO071-047001. The Archaeological Assessment submitted by the applicant is noted. The Further Information submitted clarifies that the load bearing capacity of the culvert/mill race is sufficient and that 800mm of material is located between the top of the Mill Race and the base of the

Raft foundation. This would act as a vertical buffer zone. It is regrettable that a portion of the Monument has been constructed on without initial archaeological oversight however, the results are accepted as the Mill race survives beneath the extension (and preservation in situ has essentially been achieved).

3.3. Third Party Observations

- 3.3.1. The Planning Authority received 1 no. submission/observation in relation to the application. The issues raised are similar to those set out in the appeal.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. Reg. Ref. 22/5955 – Permission was refused for the construction of 2 no. two-bedroom apartments ancillary to the main dwelling house, connection to the public sewer together with all ancillary site works, on part of the application site. Permission was refused for the following reason: (1) The proposed development by reason of its site layout, design and positioning would represent a poor quality and unacceptable development in an existing residential area that does not respond to the site context and would interfere with the character of its surrounding area and the residential amenity of an existing dwelling. The proposed development would also provide a substandard level of residential amenity for future occupiers and would therefore be contrary to the Apartment Guidelines 2022. The proposed development would not represent an appropriate form of development and would therefore be seriously injurious to the residential amenity and visual character of the area and would establish an undesirable precedent for similar development contrary to Objective RP 5-1 and ZU 18-9 of the Cork County Development Plan 2022.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.1.1. Volume Four refers to South Cork and Section 4.3 refers to Macroom. Under the provisions of the Plan as indicated on the zoning Map of Macroom the appeal site is zoned - Existing Residential/Mixed Residential.
- 5.1.2. The scale of new residential and mixed residential developments within the Existing Residential/Mixed Residential and Other Uses within the settlement network should

normally respect the pattern and grain of existing urban development in the surrounding area. Overall increased densities are encouraged within the settlement network and in particular, within high quality public transport corridors, sites adjoining Town Centres Zonings and in Spatial Policy Areas identified in the Development Plan unless otherwise specified, subject to compliance with appropriate design/amenity standards and protecting the residential amenity of the area. Other uses/non-residential uses should protect and/or improve residential amenity and uses that do not support, or threatens the vitality or integrity of, the primary use of these existing residential/mixed residential and other uses areas will not be encouraged.

- 5.1.3. Volume One refers to Main Policy Material
- 5.1.4. Chapter 16 refers to Built and Cultural Heritage
- 5.1.5. County Development Plan Objectives HE 16-2: Protection of Archaeological Sites and Monuments
- 5.1.6. Secure the preservation (i.e. preservation in situ or in exceptional cases preservation by record) of all archaeological monuments and their setting included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) (see www.archaeology.ie) and the Record of Monuments and Places (RMP) and of sites, features and objects of archaeological and historical interest generally.
- 5.1.7. In securing such preservation, the planning authority will have regard to the advice and recommendations of the Development Applications Unit of the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage as outlined in the Frameworks and Principles for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage policy document or any changes to the policy within the lifetime of the Plan.
- 5.1.8. County Development Plan Objectives HE 16-14: Record of Protected Structure
 - a) The identification of structures for inclusion in the Record will be based on criteria set out in the Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2011).
 - b) Extend the Record of Protected Structures in order to provide a comprehensive schedule for the protection of structures of special importance in the County during the lifetime of the Plan as resources allow.

- c) Seek the protection of all structures within the County, which are of special architectural, historical, archaeological, artistic, cultural, scientific, social or technical interest. In accordance with this objective, a Record of Protected Structures has been established and is set out in Volume Two Heritage and Amenity, Chapter 1 Record of Protected Structures.
- d) Ensure the protection of all structures (or parts of structures) contained in the Record of Protected Structures.
- e) Protect the curtilage and attendant grounds of all structures included in the Record of Protected Structures.
- f) Ensure that development proposals are appropriate in terms of architectural treatment, character, scale and form to the existing protected structure and not detrimental to the special character and integrity of the protected structure and its setting.
- g) Ensure high quality architectural design of all new developments relating to or which may impact on structures (and their settings) included in the Record of Protected Structures.
- h) Promote and ensure best conservation practice through the use of specialist conservation professionals and craft persons.
- i) In the event of a planning application being granted for development within the curtilage of a protected structure, that the repair of a protected structure is prioritised in the first instance i.e. the proposed works to the protected structure should occur, where appropriate, in the first phase of the development to prevent endangerment, abandonment and dereliction of the structure.

5.1.9. Volume Two refers to Heritage and Amenity

5.1.10. RPS No. 2370 - Ruined Mill Buildings & Mill Race, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

- The Gearagh SAC (Site Code 000108) is located 1.8km to the south of the appeal site.
- The Gearagh SPA (Site Code 004109) is located 2.2km to the south of the appeal site.

- Mullaghanish to Musheramore SPA (Site Code 004162) is located 5.71km to the north-west of the appeal site.

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1.1. The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 in the Appendix of this report). The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

A third party appeal was submitted by John White on the 17th of November 2025. The issues raised are as follows;

- The grant of permission is for a structure which was built over an existing Mill Water culvert which was serving the adjoining Mill/Race (Protected Structure No. RPS 2370). There is a legal dispute between the present owner of the dwelling Milmac Ltd. and the Mill owner Mr. John White.
- The appeal includes a copy of a map prepared by Gerard Moynihan B.E. Consulting Engineer showing the water culvert (“R-S”). A copy of the map and a legal letter was sent to Milmac Ltd. which advised that the water culvert may be required to be repaired, reinstated or restored by Mr. John White in the future.
- It is stated that the present owner of the dwelling commenced construction on an unauthorised extension in April 2025 and was served an Enforcement Notice E/25/07 to cease construction on the site and dismantle the extension with 8 weeks of the issuing of the notice. It is stated that the owner continued construction after receipt of the notice.
- It is submitted that the proposed development may negatively impact the character, setting and structural stability of the protected structure which is the oldest water

mill in Ireland. Therefore, concern is raised that the proposal would result in the endangerment of a Protected Structure.

- Concern is expressed that there was failure to respect architectural heritage.
- Obstruction or overloading of the water culvert could result in blockage, collapse or impaired access for maintenance which would create potential flood hazard.
- The granting of the proposed development creates a precedent for similar unauthorised works.
- The proposed development would be contrary to planning policies contained in the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028.
- It is submitted that inadequate structural or engineering justification has been provided. There is a lack of evidence that the culvert can safely withstand the load of the extension or that the works are structurally sound.
- Overall concern is raised in relation to the unauthorised development which has been carried out.

7.2. Applicant Response

A response to the third party appeal has been submitted by Gerald McCarty Architects on behalf of the applicant Milmac Limited. The issues raised are as follows:

- It is stated that the legal dispute between the owner of the dwelling, Milmac Limited and the Mill owner, Mr. John White is not a dispute which can be resolved through the planning system.
- A letter was issued from Milmac Limited to the appellant Mr. John White in relation to the dispute over the Wayleave/Right of Way.
- It is highlighted that there is no Wayleave/Right of Way interacting with the subject development.
- It is stated in paragraph 2 of point 1 of the appeal is incorrect. The applicant received a warning notice from Cork County Council in relation to the construction of the extension. The applicant immediately contacted Cork County Council and a

preplanning meeting was held and a pathway to resolve the warning letter was agreed.

- This led to a retention application being lodged to the Council which included comprehensive specialist reports.
- The issues raised in the appeal concerning endangerment of a Protected Structure, failure to respect Architectural Heritage and obstruction or overloading of a water culvert are considered similar topics and they are addressed collectively.
- The planning application was supported by a Structural Appraisal which includes a CCTV survey which was carried out by PMCG Consulting Engineers Limited and an Architectural Impact Assessment which was prepared by Dr. Maurice F. Hurley, Consultant Archaeologist.
- It is submitted that these expert reports comprehensively address the concerns in relation to endangerment of the Protected Structure, failure to respect Architectural Heritage and obstruction or overloading of the water culvert.
- The Structural report concluded that “the construction of the extension over the race will have no detrimental effect on the structural integrity of the race, this conclusion is further supported by the fact that the CCTV survey did not detect any movement/distortion to the race culvert walls or roof.”
- Therefore, it is stated that it has been clearly demonstrated that no ‘obstruction or overloading of the historic culvert has occurred as a result of the construction of the subject development.
- The primary function of the culvert serving the adjacent Mill is now redundant and its only function is the passage of minor groundwater flows.
- The construction of a small extension to the existing dwelling (across a very short mid-section of the culvert) will not impede the future maintenance of the culvert.
- It is concluded in the Archaeological Impact Assessment that “There is no impact on the Recorded Monument (RMP CO071-047001) nor the Protected Structure (RPS ID 2370) arising from the extension for which retention is sought.

- It is highlighted that the application was assessed by the Council's Archaeologist, Conservation Officer, Area Engineer and Area Planners, who concurred with the findings of the expert reports.
- A section of the Archaeologist's report is noted which states, "It is regrettable that a portion of the Monument has been constructed on without initial archaeological oversight however I will accept the results which are that the Mill race survives beneath the extension (and preservation in situ has essentially been achieved)."
- A section of the report of the Conservation Officer is noted which states, "I am satisfied that the tailrace is not under undue loading as a result of the construction of the extension."
- The Conservation Officer recommended the inclusion of a planning condition relating to the relocation of the existing oil tank and associated cabling and oil feed, and the restoration of any damage to the adjacent stone wall. Whilst the current oil tank arrangement was in place when the applicant acquired the property they confirm that the applicant is fully committed to carrying out the requirements of condition no. 5 of the decision to grant permission, in accordance with the agreed Method Statement.
- In relation to the matter of a precedent being established for unauthorised works, it is stated that the application went through the planning process and that if the permitted of retention of a structure over a culvert and beside a Protected Structure would set an undesirable precedent and undermine policy the application would have been refused by the Planning Authority.
- It is the opinion that of the applicant's Architect that the application complies with both national and local development policies. The appellant states that there are non-compliances with the County Development Plan policies, however they have not been set out.
- Regarding the matter of inadequate structural or engineering justification a comprehensive structural report was prepared by PMCG Consulting Engineers.
- Regarding the matter of unauthorised development concerns, if the Planning Authority found the works materially non-compliant with long standing planning

controls or statutory protections then they would have refused planning permission.

- The concerns raised by the appellant have been comprehensively addressed, both in the original application documentation and reiterated in the response to the grounds of appeal.
- The applicant respectfully requests that An Coimisiún Pleanála uphold the decision of Cork County Council.

7.3. 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 Commission as part of the appeal documentation and has no further comment to make in this matter.

8.0 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 issue in this appeal to be considered is as follows:

- Compliance with Development Plan policy
- Impact of proposed development on Protected Structure

8.1. Compliance with Development Plan policy

- 8.1.1. The appeal site at Maghereen, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork is located on lands zoned – ‘Existing Residential/Mixed Residential’ under the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. The extension of a residential property would therefore be acceptable in terms of the zoning provision.
- 8.1.2. The grounds of appeal stated that the proposed development would be contrary to planning policies contained in the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. I

would note that the appeal does not refer to any specific policy and that it is a generalised point.

- 8.1.3. Chapter 16 of the Development Plan refers to Built and Cultural Heritage. The site is within the curtilage of a Protected Structure comprising Mill Buildings and Mill Races (RPS 2370). County Development Plan Objective HE 16-14 refers to Record of Protected Structures. Part (e) specifies the protection of the curtilage and attendant grounds of all Protected Structures. Part (f) seeks to ensure that development proposals are appropriate in terms of architectural treatment, character, scale and form to the existing protected structure and not detrimental to the special character and integrity of the protected structure and its setting.
- 8.1.4. County Development Plan Objective HE 16-2 refers to the Protection of Archaeological Sites and Monuments it seeks the secure preservation either in situ or in exceptional cases preservation by record of all archaeological monuments and their setting included in the Sites and Monuments Record. The site is part of a Recorded Archaeological Monument Mill CO071-047001 which is described as an abandoned two-storey structure named 'Corn Mill' on the 1843 OS 6-inch map.
- 8.1.5. In order to assess whether the development proposed for retention is in accordance with County Development Plan Objective HE 16-2 and County Development Plan Objective HE 16-14 which I consider to be relevant development plan objectives, it is necessary to examine the impact of the proposal on the Protected Structure and Monument.

8.2. Impact of proposed development on Protected Structure

- 8.2.1. The proposed extension for retention with a floor area of 34.78sq m has been constructed to the rear of the existing two-storey detached dwelling. It is contended in the appeal that the proposal may negatively impact the character and setting and structural stability of the Protected Structure. The grounds of appeal highlighted that the extension has been built over the mill race.
- 8.2.2. The Planning Authority in their assessment of the proposal sought further information in relation to two matters. The first referred to the requirement to remove cabling in the wall of the Protected Structure and the submission of a Method Statement for the reinstatement of the damaged section of the wall. The second

item referred to the submission of detailed information in relation to the potential impact/loading that the extension may place on the tailrace of the mill.

- 8.2.3. In response to the request for further information the applicant submitted a Method Statement prepared by Dr. Maurice F, Hurley, Consultant Archaeologist. It is detailed in the Method Statement that the proposed repair works are deemed essential to restore the integrity of an element of the Protected Structure. The works entail the disconnection of the cables and their removal. It is stated that the stonework used to repair the wall will mirror the existing stone of the wall and lime mortar will be used. The works are to be carried out by a qualified stone mason. The report of the Council's Conservation Officer dated 15/10/2025 stated that they considered the Method Statement was satisfactory.
- 8.2.4. Regarding the matter of the potential impact/loading of the extension on the mill tailrace a response was prepared by PMCG Consulting Engineers Limited and submitted to the Planning Authority on the 25/9/2025. It is detailed that the mill race runs in an east to west direction parallel to the rear wall of the two-storey dwelling on the site. In relation to the where the mill race passes under the new extension, there is 800mm of cover between the top of the race and the underside of the raft foundation.
- 8.2.5. The Consulting Engineers carried out CCTV surveying of the mill race at various intervals from the eastern inlet. The surveying indicated that the race is structurally sound and there is no structural damage resulting from the extension which has been constructed over it. While the surveying identified some loose stones at the base of the culvert this was identified as occurring from erosion from waterflow over the years rather than from structural damage arising from the constructed extension. The walls and roof of the culvert were found to be structurally sound and showed no evidence of being overstressed. The Consulting Engineers concluded that the construction of the extension over the mill race will have no detrimental effect on the structural integrity of the mill race.
- 8.2.6. In relation to the matter of potential obstruction or overloading of the mill race which was raised in the appeal, I note the response from the first party which states that the primary function of the culvert serving the adjacent Mill is now redundant and its only function is the passage of minor groundwater flows. Therefore, having regard

to the fact that the integrity of the mill race has been confirmed by the applicant's Consulting Engineers and the fact that it has limited functions regarding the conveying of water due to the mill function being long abandoned, I am satisfied that obstruction or overloading of the mill race would not arise.

- 8.2.7. The report of the Council's Conservation Officer dated 15/10/2025 stated that the further information submitted clarifies that the load bearing capacity of the culvert/mill race is sufficient and that the 800mm of material located between the top of the mill race and the base of the raft foundation would act as a vertical buffer zone. They concluded that while it was regrettable that a portion of the monument has been constructed on without initial archaeological oversight, it is accepted that the mill race survives beneath the extension and that preservation in situ has essentially been achieved.
- 8.2.8. An Archaeological Impact Assessment prepared by Dr. Maurice F, Hurley, Consultant Archaeologist was submitted to the Planning Authority on the 1/9/2025. In relation to the siting and design of the subject extension relative to the Mill Building, I note that it is detailed in the assessment that it set back circa 7.4m from the main wall of the building and that the new extension has not had a physical impact on the extant remains of the adjacent mill. It is highlighted in the assessment that the appeal site while historically part of the curtilage of the mill is no longer part of the mill property as the house on site is a separate property. In relation to the potential visual impact of the subject extension upon the setting of the Mill Building, I note that as detailed in the assessment that the extension is located to the northern side of the existing dwelling and that it is screened from view by the standing remnants of annex wall of the Mill Building.
- 8.2.9. Accordingly, having regard to the limited size and scale of the extension and the existing siting of the dwelling on site relative to the Mill Building, I consider that it would not unduly impact upon the character and setting of the Protected Structure. Should the Commission decide to grant permission to the retain the subject extension, I would recommend the attachment of a condition referring the removal of the cabling and reinstatement of the wall of the Mill Building as detailed in the Method Statement which was recommended by the Council's Conservation Officer and attached to the permission issued by the Planning Authority.

8.2.10. In conclusion, having regard to the details set out above I conclude that the extension proposed for retention would not adversely impact upon the character and setting of the Ruined Mill Buildings & Mill Race, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork, Protected Structure (RPS 2370) and that it would not unduly impact on the Recorded Monument (CO071-047001).

9.0 AA Screening

9.1. I have considered case PL-500295-Ck-25 in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended.

9.2. The closest European Sites, part of the Natura 2000 Network, are the Gearagh SAC (Site Code 000108) which is located 1.8km to the south of the appeal site, the Gearagh SPA (Site Code 004109) which is located 2.2km to the south of the appeal site and Mullaghanish to Musheramore SPA (Site Code 004162) which is located 5.71km to the north-west of the appeal site.

9.3. The proposed development comprises the retention of an extension to a dwelling, together with ancillary works.

9.4. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

9.5. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

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

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

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

10.0 Water Framework Directive

- 10.1. The subject site is located at Maghereen, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork. It is situated on the northern side of Coolyhane Road circa 700m to the north-west of Macroom Main Street. The Sullan River (IE_SW_19S020480) a tributary of the River Lee is located 124m to the east of the appeal site. Carrigdrohid lake (IE_SW_19_139) is located 1.8km to the south of the appeal site. The ground waterbody Ballinhassig West (Code IE_SW_G_005) underlies the site.
- 10.2. The proposal comprises the retention of a as built extension to a dwelling together with all other ancillary site works, on a 0.102 hectares site, at Maghereen, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork. The grounds of appeal have not raised the matter of the Water Framework Directive.
- 10.3. I have assessed the proposed development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater waterbodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.
- 10.4. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:
- Size and scale of the proposed development within urban zoned lands.
 - Distance to the nearest waterbody at 124m east of the subject site.
 - Connection to public water and public wastewater.

Conclusion

- 10.5. 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.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1. I recommend that permission be granted for the retention of the development.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1. Having regard to the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, the siting and design of the extension proposed for retention, it is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, it would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or of property in the vicinity. The proposed development would not adversely impact on the character and setting of the Ruined Mill Buildings & Mill Race, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork, Protected Structure (RPS 2370). The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be retained and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application as amended by the further plans and particulars submitted on the 1st day of September 2025 and 25th day of September 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.

- (a) The removal of cabling and oil feed from the wall of the east-west range of Protected Structure (RPS 2370) and the making good of the damaged section of the wall with matching stone and lime mortar with aggregate to match the existing shall be carried out no later than 16 weeks from the date of the grant

of the planning permission. This shall be carried out in line with the details in the Method Statement submitted to the Planning Authority on the 25th day of September 2025.

- (b) A photographic report shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority, on completion of the works as detailed in 2 (a) above.

Reason: In the interest of the protection of architectural heritage.

3. 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.

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 me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.”

Siobhan Carroll

Planning Inspector

19th of March 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	500295-Ck-25
Proposed Development Summary	Permission for the retention of as-built extension to the rear (northern) elevation of existing dwelling house together with all other ancillary site works which is in the curtilage of a Protected Structure.
Development Address	Maghereen, Masseytown, Macroom, Co. Cork.
IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q.2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
(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>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3</p>	
<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>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p>	

<p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	
<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____