



Inspector's Report

PL-500735-WC-26

Development	Permission to demolish existing piggery complex, and construct replacement piggery complex.
Location	Derryduff, Rosscarbery, Co. Cork,
Planning Authority	West Cork County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	24520
Applicant(s)	Lisavaid Co-operative Creamery Ltd
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Grant Permission + Conditions
Type of Appeal	Third Party Normal Planning Appeal
Appellant(s)	Sean & Paula Hayes Peter Hayes Patrick Deasy and Others Derryduff Residents and Neighbours Committee
Observer(s)	Enda & Raisa Corneille
Date of Site Inspection	9 th April 2026
Inspector	Matthew McRedmond

Table of Contents

1.0	Site Location and Description	3
2.0	Proposed Development.....	3
3.0	Planning Authority Decision	4
4.0	Planning History.....	11
5.0	Policy Context.....	11
6.0	EIA Screening.....	16
7.0	The Appeal	16
8.0	Assessment	25
9.0	AA Screening.....	42
10.0	Water Framework Directive.....	43
11.0	Recommendation.....	43
12.0	Reasons and Considerations	43
13.0	Conditions.....	44
	Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening	52
	Appendix 2: Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination Form.....	55
	Appendix 3: AA Screening Determination	66
	Appendix 4 – WFD Assessment	74

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The subject site is located in the rural area of Derryduff, Rosscarbery, Co. Cork. The site is approximately 2ha in area and accessed via a laneway of approximately 500m in length from the south side of a local road, the L-8014-8. There is an existing pig farm within the site that houses 1,250 pigs in a mixture of weaning and fattening pigs. The existing site consists of the access laneway and single-story pig houses and associated feed silos for the existing operational piggery. Lisavaird is located 2.25km to the southeast and Rosscarbery 4km to the southwest.
- 1.2. There is a single dwelling located on the north side of the L-8014-8 road, opposite the entrance to the site, approximately 500m from the piggery itself. The closest dwelling to the existing premises is approximately 265m to the east across agricultural fields.
- 1.3. The piggery is on an exposed, elevated site but is screened by a strand of trees that buffer views of the premises from the north. A standing stone recorded monument is located c. 200m to the southeast with two ringforts also located 2-300 metres from the site.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development consists of the demolition of the existing piggery complex and construction of new piggery that will include the following:
 - 2no. pig houses with slatted slurry tanks
 - 3no. roofed pig passages with slatted slurry tanks
 - Plant room
 - Pig loading bay
 - 6no. feed storage bins
 - Rainwater harvesting tank,
 - rainwater attenuation tank
 - Relocation of site entrance gates to within the existing laneway,

- All associated site works.
- The proposed facility is to accommodate 2,000 weaner pigs and 1,600 finisher or production pigs, above 30kg.

3.0 **Planning Authority Decision**

3.1. **Decision**

3.1.1. On the 15th January 2026, Cork County Council granted permission for the proposed piggery subject to 25no. Conditions.

3.1.2. Conditions

- Condition 2 (C2): Maximum pig numbers shall not exceed 2,000 weaners and 1,600 finishers/production pigs.
- C3: Monthly Record of pig numbers and details to be kept on site for inspection.
- C9: Noise levels not to exceed 43dB(A) at noise sensitive location, or a 5dB(A) increase above background noise.
- C10: All odour mitigation measures to be implemented and kept within EPA recommended limit of 3.0 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
- C15: Works to be suspended if any bat roosts are encountered during demolition works.
- C24: All above ground fuel tanks to be contained in a waterproof bunded area.

3.2. **Planning Authority Reports**

3.2.1. The Local Authority planning reports were comprehensively addressed within an Area Planner's Reports, Senior Executive Planner's Reports and Senior Planner's Report. These reports covered the initial assessment, assessment of Further Information (FI) and assessment of clarification of Further Information (CFI). They had regard to the location of the site, planning history, national and local policy, the details submitted by the applicant and to the referral responses received. The basis of the Planning Authority's decision includes:

3.2.2. **Senior Executive Planner's Report:** Includes main assessment report of initial proposal. Noted site is located within a "Tourism and Rural Diversification Area" in the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028. Accepts the existing piggery complex was in place prior to dwellings in the area. Existing screen planting to north is noted, with views from the south and west. Long established nature of piggery at this location is noted with permission granted in 1988. Subsequent permission granted by Cork CC and An Bord Pleanála from 2006, has not been implemented.

3.2.3. Appears site is no longer used as a pig breeding facility, as originally permitted, and has instead changed to production pigs. When this occurred should be clarified by the applicant. Given the established nature of this agricultural use, no objections to the principle of development subject to normal planning and sustainable development considerations. Considerable gaps in the information submitted, which needs to be addressed by the applicant as follows:

- Clarity with regard to pig numbers and types to be accommodated within the proposed piggery buildings. A total of 6,000 pigs may be accommodated based on floor areas and compliance with Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations 2010.
- Pig numbers are also critical to determining EIA requirements. Schedule 7A information is required to determine EIA requirements.
- Pig numbers also needed in relation to determining IPC Licencing requirements from the EPA.
- Further details in relation to the management of slurry and land spreading locations. This is to ensure water quality protection from nitrogen and phosphorous.
- Slurry storage details required to ensure no leakage to ground water.
- Appropriate Assessment screening, ecological assessment and a Biodiversity led landscape plan required.
- Odour and Noise Assessment required in relation to proposal.
- Further information required in relation to demolition works and slurry tank removal.

- Details on water supply required including water quality test results.
 - Further details also required in relation to traffic generated by the proposal.
- 3.2.4. The PA did not have sufficient information to make a decision on the subject application and sought further information in relation to a number of items, including the main details as outlined above.
- 3.2.5. **Senior Planner's Report:** Concurs with the conclusions of the Senior Executive Planner and reports of Ecology, Environment and Area Engineer and recommended further information is sought in relation to 17no. items.

Further Information Response

- 3.2.6. The applicant submitted a further information response in June 2025, which included the following:
- Confirmation of pig numbers that there would be 2,000 weaner pigs and 1,600 finishing pigs facilitated in the proposed development. This is an increase from 900 weaners and 1,100 production pigs as permitted under Ref 06/368, ABP Ref. PL.88.219326).
 - Revised architectural and landscape drawings
 - EIAR screening report
 - Noise impact assessment
 - Water Quality Test Report
 - Drainage Impact Report
 - Well Location Map
 - Details of slurry storage system protections
 - Appropriate Assessment Screening Report
 - Bird and Bat Report
 - A construction and Demolition Waste Management Plan.
 - Odour Impact Assessment

- Ammonia Impact Assessment
- Traffic Impact Assessment that concludes traffic increases would be 1-2 additional per day maximum to already existing trips.
- Asbestos Survey Report
- Well Test Report
- Copy of An Bord Pleanála Decision ABP-88/219362
- Letter from Teagasc in relation to pig numbers
- Site Characterisation Form for on site wastewater treatment suitability

Planning Authority Response to Further Information

3.2.7. **Area Planner's Report (Note no Area Planner's Report at application stage and SEP Report was main report on initial application):** Notes submission of FI from applicant that includes EIA screening report, confirmation of pig numbers, demolition plan, noise impact assessment, odour assessment etc. Based on the details submitted, PA cannot be satisfied that sufficient information is provided to rule out the requirement for EIA and therefore recommend that a sub-threshold EIAR is submitted by the applicant. PA find that 1,770 wieners and 2,655 finisher pigs can be accommodated on site based on floor areas. Clarification of land spreading locations required despite GDPR protestations from applicant. Biodiversity plan, details of entering and exiting weights of pigs, source of pigs at Lisavaired Pig breeding farm at Kippagh are all acceptable. Road network is capable of accommodating the traffic forecast, which is identified as a slight increase. Water requirements are considered to be capable of being met by the proposed well. Water quality testing are within parameter limits. Details of protection to slurry tanks in line with EPA's IPC guidance is provided. Drainage impact assessment considered acceptable. The Area Planner recommended deferral of the application to Clarify Further Information through the submission of an EIAR, noting pig numbers are not consistent with Teagasc data and pig modelling. Land spreading details need also to be provided, and a revised noise and odour assessment based on clarified pig numbers. Ecology details in relation to nest box locations and removal of the potentially invasive *Quercus ilex* species from the planting plan.

- 3.2.8. **Senior Executive Planner's Report:** Report is consistent and concurs with Area Planner's recommendation to seek clarification of further information, primarily due to the uncertainty in relation to pig numbers to be accommodated in the proposal. A sub-threshold EIAR was recommended along with noise, odour, and ecology matters as recommended by the area planner.
- 3.2.9. **Senior Planner's Report:** The reports of the Area Planner, Senior Executive Planner, Environment Officer, Ecological Officer and Area Engineer are noted and further information is recommended in relation to ecology, noise and odour and submission of an EIAR.

Clarification of Further Information (CFI) Response

3.2.10. The applicant submitted clarification details including:

- Proposed development areas and pig numbers
- Slurry management plan indicating capacity at receiving lands for nutrient loading from additional slurry
- Confirmation of validity of Noise Impact Assessment based on confirmed pig numbers.
- Confirmation of validity of Odour Impact Assessment based on confirmed pig numbers.
- Details of nest box locations.
- Updated landscaping plan.

Planning Authority Response to CFI

- 3.2.11. **Area Planner** – Confirmed details of pig numbers (which is limited to 1,600 finisher pigs and does not exceed 2,000 pigs of 30kg or more) does not trigger the requirement for EIAR. Other reports in relation to odour, air and slurry spreading are acceptable to the Environment Officer and permission is recommended subject to conditions.
- 3.2.12. **Senior Executive Planner** – Satisfied with the clarified further information including clarified pig numbers (2,000 weaners and 1,600 production pigs), Slurry Management Plan confirming nutrient capacity of landholdings, acceptable noise and odour assessment based on confirmation of pig numbers, confirmed nesting box

locations, revised planting plan, confirmation that proposal for management of slurry will comply with Good Agricultural Practice and will not require AA, will not require submission of an EIAR and recommended a grant of permission subject to conditions.

3.2.13. **Senior Planner** – Agree with the conclusion that EIAR is not required and agree with conclusions of Area Planner, Senior Executive Planner and internal Departments and recommend a grant of permission.

3.2.14. Other Technical Reports

- **Area Engineer** – Setback of gate acceptable to allow vehicles to pull into site if gates are closed. Sightlines acceptable, as is levels of vehicular traffic, considering existing operation. Further information recommended in relation to origin of pigs to the piggery in terms of traffic generated, water supply and wells within 250m of site, likely procedures in event of slurry storage system failure. This information was provided by the applicant and had no objection subject to conditions.
- **Environment Officer** – Noted proposed increase of 500 weaners and 750 fatteners (production pigs), to 2,000 weaners and 1,600 production pigs. Area of proposed building suggests capacity for considerably more pigs (4,643 wieners and 2,015 production pigs) than stated. Justification required from applicant. Noise and odour details required. Details of slurry spreading and Nutrient Management Plan required. Construction and demolition waste management plan required for removal of existing buildings and slurry storage. This information was submitted at FI stage and Environment had no objection subject to conditions.
- **PA Ecologist** – Further details required in relation to Appropriate Assessment screening and ecology including breeding birds and possibly bats. This information was submitted at FI stage and Ecology had no objection subject to conditions.

3.3. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.3.1. **Inland Fisheries Ireland:** Further information required in relation nutrient levels in spreadlands, Nutrient Management Plans for spreadlands and maps showing

locations of spreadlands. This information was submitted by the applicant and considered acceptable.

3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1. A number of third party observations were submitted in relation to the subject proposal and are taken as summarised in the PA reports on this proposal. The main points for the purposes of my assessment are as follows:

- Increase in pig numbers from 1250 to 3600 is a concern for reason of increased traffic, odour, noise and disturbance to residential dwellings.
- Surface water and dust issues from access lane have not been adequately addressed.
- Impacts on private wells from ground water contamination is a concern.
- Impacts of slurry spreading and capacity of lands to absorb additional slurry is queried.
- Environmental impacts from additional ammonia, air pollution, vermin, asbestos in buildings to be demolished and queries on long-term sustainability in relation to climate impacts.
- Ecological impacts and need for Appropriate Assessment screening.
- Unacceptable impact on local cultural heritage sites – standing stone and ringforts.
- EIAR required under the precautionary principle and given total pig numbers of 3,000. EIA Screening and AA screening required at a minimum.
- Concern in relation to size of facility and actual pig numbers to be accommodated, which may trigger requirement for an EIAR. IPC Licence from EPA may also be necessary.

4.0 Planning History

- 4.1. **Cork County Council (Cork CC) Ref. 88/205, ABP Ref. PL 4/5/76047:** permission granted for the provision of a pig breeding facility capable of accommodating not more than 310 sows, 20 boars and 1,000 weaners.
- 4.2. **Cork CC Ref. 06/368 / ABP Ref. PL 88.219326:** Granted permission for a revised layout of the existing unit to facilitate the following numbers or their combined equivalent: 280 sows, 350 suckling bonhams, 900 weaners, 1,100 fatteners, 30 gilts and seven boars. From submitted plans and existing shed units on site, while the retention element is as existing, the extension was not constructed.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. National Policy

National Planning Framework (NPF) (First Revision 2025)

- 5.1.1. The NPF notes the agri-food sector continues to play an integral part in Ireland's economy and is our largest indigenous industry, contributing 165,000 direct jobs and generating 9% of merchandise exports in 2023. Agriculture has traditionally been the most important contributor to rural economies and it remains important as a significant source of income and both direct and indirect employment. However, it must adapt to the challenges posed by modernisation, restructuring, market development and the increasing importance of environmental issues related to climate change impacts and biodiversity loss.
- 5.1.2. Much of the economic benefits in the agri-food sector are dispersed throughout the country making it particularly vital to rural areas and economic development generally. Continued development of the agri-food sector will be supported through the implementation of Food Vision 2030.
- 5.1.3. The NPF contains a number of relevant National Strategic Outcomes (NSOs) and National Policy Objectives (NPOs). The following is of relevance to the subject proposal:
- 5.1.4. National Policy Objective (NPO) 33 seeks to: *“Support the agri-food industry in promoting Ireland’s continued food security in a manner that ensures economic,*

environmental, and social sustainability while ensuring progress in achieving targets in the National Climate Action Plan 2024 and the River Basin Management Plan.”.

Food Vision 2030

The Food Vision 2030 Strategy is a ten year Strategy for the Irish agri-food sector (taken to include primary agriculture, food and drink processing and manufacturing, fisheries, aquaculture and fish processing, forestry and forestry processing and the equine sector). The Strategy consists of 22 Goals, grouped into four high level Missions for the sector to work toward:

- 1) A Climate Smart, Environmentally Sustainable Agri Food Sector;
- 2) Viable and Resilient Primary Producers with Enhanced Well-Being;
- 3) Food which is Safe, Nutritious and Appealing, Trusted and Valued at Home and Abroad;
- 4) An Innovative, Competitive and Resilient Agri-Food Sector, Driven by Technology and Talent.

Food Vision 2030 is a strategic framework, within which other policies, plans and programmes are being and will be developed.

Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (Southern Regional Assembly) 2020-2032

5.1.5. Supports the rural countryside as a lived in landscape with a focus on rural economies:

- RPO 43: It is an objective to harness the potential of shared learning and good practice from European Programmes and policy to assist rural development.
- RPO 44: *It is an objective to ensure the delivery of sustainable actions under the Rural Development Programme (RDP) 2014-20 and beyond in priority areas of innovation, bio-diversity restoration, water and soil management, renewable energy and waste management, carbon conservation and sequestration, diversification, job creation and ICT development in our rural areas.*
- RPO 50 relates to Diversification whereby:
It is an objective to further develop a diverse base of smart economic specialisms across the rural Region, including innovation and diversification in agriculture (agri-

Tech, food and beverage), the marine (ports, fisheries and the wider blue economy potential), forestry, peatlands, renewable energy, tourism (leverage the opportunities from the Wild Atlantic Way, Ireland's Ancient East and Ireland's Hidden Heartlands brands), social enterprise, circular economy, knowledge economy, global business services, fin-tech, specialised engineering, heritage, arts and culture, design and craft industries as dynamic divers for the rural economy.

5.2. Water Framework Directive

5.2.1. Under the EU Water Framework Directive Member States are required to achieve 'good' status in all waters and must ensure that status does not deteriorate. The Directive has been given effect by the Surface Water and Groundwater Regulations. The main objectives of the WFD are to:

- Achieve at least Good Status for all water bodies by 2027.
- Prevent deterioration of existing water quality.
- Restore water bodies that are not meeting the required standards.

5.2.2. In Ireland, the implementation of the WFD is managed through River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs), which are developed and reviewed every six years. The first RBMPs covered the period from 2010 to 2015, with subsequent plans addressing the periods of 2018-2021 and 2022-2027. The Minister for Housing, Local Government and Heritage is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the directive, while the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) leads the technical aspects and monitoring efforts.

5.3. National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP) 2023-2030

5.3.1. The NBAP includes five strategic objectives aimed at addressing existing challenges and new and emerging issues associated with biodiversity loss. Section 59B(1) of the Wildlife (Amendment) Act 2000 (as amended) requires the Commission, as a public body, to have regard to the objectives and targets of the NBAP in the performance of its functions, to the extent that they may affect or relate to the functions of the Commission. The impact of development on biodiversity, including species and habitats, can be assessed at a European, National and Local level and is taken into account in our decision-making having regard to the Habitats and Birds Directives, Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, Water Framework Directive and Marine

Strategy Framework Directive, and other relevant legislation, strategy and policy where applicable.

5.4. S.I. No. 42 of 2025 (European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2025) (GAP Regulations)

- 5.4.1. Updates and replaces S.I. No. 113 of 2022. This regulatory framework ensures that slurry application is managed in a manner that protects water quality and complies with relevant environmental safeguards.
- 5.4.2. The GAP regulations also control when where and how slurry and soiled water can be applied to land. All farm operators are required to comply with these regulations to minimise potential impacts on water quality.

5.5. Department of Agriculture Specification S.141, Minimum Specification for New Pig Houses, (April 2025)

- 5.5.1. Sets out required floor area for new pig houses based on animal weight with 0.2sqm being required per pig less than 10kg in weight and 1.1sqm required for finisher pigs above 110kg.

5.6. EPA's instruction note for the assessment of odour emissions from intensive agriculture pig installations (EPA, 2022)

- 5.6.1. Sets out that for the purposes of this instructional note, the acceptable odour levels specific to intensive agriculture are 3.0 OUE/m³ for new pig-production units. A limit of 5.0 is provided for existing pig facilities, which are defined as premises licenced by the EPA between 2001 and 2017.

5.7. Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028

- 5.7.1. The subject site is located in a rural area as defined in the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028 as a "Tourism and Rural Diversification Area". Section 8.15 of the Development Plan relates to the Rural Economy where the following objective EC 8-13 is noted:

"a) Encourage employment growth in County towns to support the population of the towns and their wider rural catchments.

b) Strengthen rural economies through the promotion of innovation and diversification into new sectors and services including to ensure economic resilience and job creation.

c) New development in rural areas should be sensitively designed and planned to provide for the protection of the biodiversity of the rural landscape.”

5.7.2. Objective EC 8-15 in relation to Agriculture and Farm Diversification states as follows:

“a) Encourage the development of sustainable agriculture and related infrastructure including farm buildings;

b) Prioritising the development of sustainable rural housing to support working farmers and their employees (see Chapter 5 Rural);

c) Encouraging farm diversification through the development of other sustainable business initiatives appropriate to the rural area (see Chapter 5 Rural);

d) and Supporting appropriate proposals for sustainable tourism development. (See Chapter 5 Rural and Chapter 10 Tourism).”

5.8. Natural Heritage Designations

5.8.1. The following Natura 2000 European sites are identified within a 15km zone of influence from the proposed development:

- Kilkeran Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC (Site Code 001061) – 3.6km southwest.
- Clonakilty Bay SAC (Site Code 000091) – 5.7km southeast.
- Myross Wood SAC (Site Code 001070) – 11.1km southwest.
- Bandon River SAC (Site Code 002171 – 13.5km north.
- Castletownshend SAC (Site Code 001547) – 13.9km southwest.
- Clonakilty Bay SPA (Site Code 004081) – 5.8km southeast
- Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA (Site Code 004190) – 7km southeast
- Seven Heads SPA (Site Code 004191) – 14.1km southeast

6.0 EIA Screening

- 6.1.1. I note the details submitted on appeal in relation to requirements for an EIAR. I have provided a full assessment of EIAR requirements in the assessment section of this report and in the attached appendices.
- 6.1.2. Having regard to: -
1. The criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular
 - (a) the limited nature and scale of the proposed piggery development, in an established agricultural area already the site of an established piggery
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, and the proposed mitigation measures to be provided as part of the proposed development
 - (c) the location of the development outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)
 2. The results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant
 3. The features and measures proposed by the applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment, and in particular the proposal to limit the number of production/finisher pigs to 1,600, the management of odour and noise impacts, the biodiversity measures proposed and the limited level of traffic to be generated by the proposal
- 6.1.3. The Commission concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required. Please see attached Preliminary Examination and EIA Screening Determination (Form 1 and Form 3) in the appendix to this report.

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. 4no. third party appeals have been submitted against the decision made by Cork County Council to grant permission for the proposed development.

7.1.2. The grounds of appeal may be summarised as follows:

Mischaracterisation of Proposed Development

- Development is a significant intensification of use and not a replacement or upgrade piggery as submitted.
- The more than threefold increase in pig numbers is a shift from a small piggery to a commercial unit.

Planning Compliance History

- Applicant has not complied with grant of permission in 2006 that sought permission for the retention of the revised layout of the existing unit. Planting was also not carried out from the original permission.
- Original permission at this location was for 200 sows but facility currently houses 500 weaners and 750 fattening pigs.

Pig Numbers and EIAR Requirements

- When assessed in accordance with S. 141 – Minimum Specification for New Pig Houses (Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, April 2025). The proposed unit can accommodate a significantly greater number of pigs than stated.
- Pig numbers cannot be controlled by the planning system, and the proposal should be assessed based on capacity.
- A total of 2,000 weaners and 2,180 finisher pigs can be accommodated within the proposal based on floor areas and standard space requirements. Intermediate growth of between 30kg to 110kg is not accounted for within the submitted calculations.
- Scale of proposal may cater for up to 4,180 pigs and therefore triggers requirement for EIAR. One appeal claims the submitted number of pigs at 3,600 requires EIAR.

- Based on 610sqm for weaner pigs and 1,812sqm for finisher (production pigs), 2,000 weaner pigs may be accommodated and 2,180 finisher, or production pigs.
- Actual capacity rather than stated pig numbers is the determining factor in relation to EIAR requirement and the application clearly breaches the 2,000-finisher pig threshold. The absence of an EIAR makes the environmental information submitted flawed and makes the grant of permission unsound.
- At a minimum an NIS should have been submitted due to potential impacts on Kilkern Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC.
- Proposal would result in an increase in greenhouse gases instead of a reduction in line with climate goals.
- Proposal is contrary to sustainable food objectives and would reduce the capacity of local residents to move to Mechanical ventilation with heat recovery due to the odours produced.

Slurry Management and Environmental Protection

- Details in relation to slurry receiving landbanks in 'coded landbank' format is not sufficient for assessment of nutrient loading or environmental risk.
- Repeated stating that landspreading will be carried out under a Nutrient Management Plan is not supported as these nutrient management plans were not provided to substantiate findings.
- Claim that slurry production would be reduced by the proposal is unfounded given the almost threefold increase in pig numbers. No calculations have been provided to support this claim of reduction. Under the 6th Nitrates Action Program 2026-2028, farmers in derogation are not permitted to import pig slurry.
- Coded landbank format of submitted information gives cause for serious concern in relation to water contamination and nutrient loading at unspecified locations. Precautionary principle must be applied in relation to risks to groundwater, public health and sensitive environments.
- Lisavaired Piggery was issued with 5 non compliance notices from the EPA in December 2024.

Insufficient Assessment of FI

- Change in agent for the submission of further information was not agreed correctly and Cork CC therefore did not have jurisdiction to decide on the subject application.
- Submitted assessments on air, odour and slurry management are incomplete as they rely on inaccurate pig numbers.
- Proposed roof fans are one of the highest sources of noise and no specifications have been provided in this regard to measure true operational noise.
- Reference to 'Poultry House' in submitted noise assessment calls into question the reliability of submitted information.
- Odour Impact Assessment is a generic assessment and not site specific, using published EPA emission factors. This approach is inadequate given proximity to residential dwellings.
- Inconsistencies in distances from nearest dwelling in noise and odour assessments is not accounted for within submitted documents.
- Noise impact assessment over a single 24 hour period does not adequately account for seasonal and peak operations. Also does not account for the anticipated increase in pig numbers.
- Ecological impacts have not been adequately quantified based on information submitted at FI stage. This is contrary to objectives 15-1, 15-2 and 15-6 of the Development Plan. Mitigation measures to conserve biodiversity and landscape character have not been provided.
- Impacts of residential amenity have not been adequately assessed and increase in odour due to increase in pig numbers will have a significant impact on residential amenity.

Traffic

- Rise in HGV numbers on local road L-8914-8 will lead to safety issues. Conditions proposed in relation to sightlines will not solve this issue.
- Sightlines and removal of hedgerow have not been appropriately resolved

Drainage Impacts

- Proposal poses significant risks to groundwater and private wells. 6 private wells within 480m of the site with the closest being 240metres from the site. This is a material factual error and understates risk to groundwater.
- Given the location of private dwellings relying on groundwater supply, the proposal undermines public health.

Bat Activity

- Timing of surveys for bats in February and early May are not appropriate to measure bat activity during the typical season of May-September.

Conclusion

- Proposal is contrary to the Cork County Development Plan relating to protection of residential amenity, control of intensive agricultural developments and protection of water quality.
- Ultimately, the Planning Authority assessment is flawed as site specific information was not appropriately provided. A Refusal of Permission should be issued.

7.2. Applicant Response

- 7.2.1. The applicant confirmed the overall process so far and submitted that the proposal will replace aging infrastructure at the existing piggery with modern, more environmentally friendly buildings that will reduce odours, improve ventilation, drainage and reduce overall emissions. The applicant has provided a response to the appeals that may be summarised under the following headings:

Planning History

- No evidence to support claims of unauthorised development at this site. Permission Ref. 06/368 (ABP Ref. PL88.219326) permitted 280 sows, 900 weaners and 1,100 production pigs. This permission also addressed existing structures on site and therefore the structures and pig numbers are in accordance with this permission.
- Further information submitted clarified pig numbers and a condition attached to the PA grant of permission limited numbers to 2,000 weaners and 1,600 finishers (production pigs).

Pig Herd Numbers

- Detailed floor area analysis confirms 610sqm for weaners and 1,812sqm for production pigs, which is consistent with Teagasc stocking norms and Department of Agriculture standards. The Planning Authority performed an independent analysis of these figures and considered them acceptable and would not have an adverse impact on the environment.

- Condition 2 of the grant of permission limits numbers to 2,000 weaners and 1,600 finishers and Condition 3 has a requirement for monitoring and record keeping. The applicant welcomes such conditions that can ensure regulatory control.

Environment

- The claims that the applicant circumvented regulatory controls to avoid EIA rules are unfounded and not supported by submitted evidence and should be dismissed.
- Submitted Environmental Impact Assessment Screening Report confirms that the nature, scale and location of the proposed development and potential emissions to air, land and water were all considered. These matters were also considered in the Appropriate Assessment (AA) of the subject proposal.
- Request for sub-threshold EIAR was based on a misunderstanding of proposed pig numbers that was clarified in a response to FI request and was considered satisfactory by the Local Authority. Final numbers were based on net floor areas, in consultation with Teagasc, and evaluated against Department of Agriculture Specifications S.141.
- Despite initial concerns in relation to landspreading impacts on European Sites, the PA Ecology officer concluded that AA was not required as nutrient management and pig production was considered acceptable by the PA Environment Officer and therefore could be excluded that the project would not have an impact on European Sites or their conservation objectives.

Slurry Management

- Adequate evidence submitted confirming slurry can be managed on agricultural lands with sufficient nutrient capacity and managed in line with GAP regulations. Impacts on European sites via hydrological pathways was specifically ruled out.
- The Planning Authority was satisfied that identified landbanks were available and could verify landbank capacity and nutrient management arrangements.
- The appeal claims that the applicant sought to avoid environmental impact assessment or provision of an NIS are unfounded and the proposal is consistent with standard agricultural practice and national regulatory requirements.

Impacts on Amenity

- Concerns in relation to impacts on groundwater, private wells and water quality are noted.
- Additional concerns noted on appeal in relation to odour, noise and residential amenity.
- The hydrogeological assessment confirmed that the site is not within any source protection zone for a public water supply and there are no known domestic abstraction wells in the immediate vicinity of the site. GSI mapping confirmed the nearest recorded wells are about 480m south of the site and at greater distances as shown on submitted mapping.
- Design of the proposal includes sealed slurry storage, controlled drainage systems, and on-site attenuation measures that prevent contamination of surrounding groundwater. Suggestions that nearby wells or water supplies will be threatened by the proposal is not backed by technical evidence.
- The submitted Drainage Impact Assessment confirms that the surface water drainage system has been designed to prevent contamination of soils and groundwater. Rainwater will discharge via attenuation and process water from pig housing will be stored in slatted tanks prior to land spreading via regulated processes.
- There is no discharge of contaminated water to surface water bodies.

- Baseline water quality testing was carried out at the current water supply serving the site and lab results confirmed compliance with drinking water regulations and advisory limits.
- Any potential impacts are hydrocarbon or other contaminant spills which are of low likelihood and not significant. The PA confirmed acceptance of the hydrogeological and drainage information submitted and included a number of conditions to ensure appropriate compliance to environmental protection measures.
- Noise impacts at the nearest noise sensitive receptors are predicted to be barely audible due to separation distances and noise attenuation incorporated into the development.
- Odour concentrations at all sensitive receptors are in line with EPA Air Dispersion Modelling Guidance and meet the relevant EPA odour criteria for new pig production units. The concern in relation to increased pig numbers from that submitted was clarified by the applicant and odour and noise impacts remain acceptable as per the originally submitted reports.
- The PA grant of permission included conditions to ensure environmental compliance in relation to noise and odour limits.
- Claims the proposal will be an 'eyesore' are not supported by the proposed design, setback from other buildings, or the detailed landscape strategy submitted with the proposal. The proposal replaces an existing piggery building and is typical of agricultural structures in this locality. Additional mounding with the proposed landscaping will further mitigate any views of the proposal.

Traffic and Road Safety

- Safety of surrounding road network to accommodate the proposal has been raised on appeal.
- 12 additional vehicle trips per month are predicted on the local road network as a result of the operational requirements of the proposal including staff attendance, deliveries, pig movements, slurry collection and waste removal. This is approximately a 1% increase on existing traffic levels which is not significant.

- Additional traffic would occur during daytime, off peak, when traffic levels on the road are lower.
- Sightlines and access arrangements are also within standard requirements and were considered acceptable by the PA.

Risk to Human Health

- Principle risks as identified by the PA include noise and odour, traffic, slurry storage and land spreading, and disposal of asbestos.
- Proposal includes clear improvements in terms of environmental control, operational management and public health protection compared to the existing structures on site.
- Ammonia emissions modelling indicates that all sensitive receptors remain considerably below relevant assessment criteria and would not pose a risk to human health.
- The proposal must comply with established animal health and biosecurity measures regulated by the Department of Agriculture and environmental protection standards. The proposed design includes modern ventilation systems, sealed storage, and waste management procedures that minimise the risk of nuisance or infestation by vermin. Conditions on the grant of permission add further safeguards to public health and environmental quality.

Ecology

- Bat surveys were undertaken in line with standard practice (Collins, 2023) and the findings are fully supported by the submitted assessments.
- A range of standard mitigation and biodiversity protected measures are incorporated into the proposal including planting of native species, artificial nesting opportunities and ecological supervision where appropriate.
- Proposal involves the replacement of an existing piggery and therefore, overall, an enhanced environment, incorporating new planting for biodiversity will improve the site.
- Appeal claims that the impacts on ecology and biodiversity have not been adequately assessed are therefore unfounded.

7.3. **Planning Authority Response**

7.3.1. None on file.

7.4. **Observations**

7.4.1. 1no. observation was submitted by a resident in the vicinity, in relation to the third party appeals received. The main points of the observation may be summarised as follows:

- Lack of certainty in relation to slurry disposal lands with related uncertainty in relation to ongoing disposal of slurry for life of project
- Cumulative nutrient assessment in relation to receiving lands is not adequate. Nitrogen and phosphorous loading not quantified.
- AA Screening is defective on the basis of inadequate assessment of slurry spreading lands and potential impacts on European sites.
- Development lifetime of proposal may not align with disposal certainty
- EIA screening defective due to cumulative impacts, ammonia deposition, odour modelling robustness and catchment level nutrient pressure. File ABP 310588-21 is referenced in terms of refusal of permission due to lack of certainty in relation to receiving lands for slurry spreading and the same principle applies to the subject proposal.

8.0 **Assessment**

8.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all submissions received in relation to the appeals, having 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:

- Preliminary Matters
- Pig Numbers
- Scope of the Assessment
- Water/Drainage Impacts
- Traffic Impacts

- Human Health Impacts
- Ecology

8.2. Preliminary Matters

- 8.2.1. Parties to the appeal raised issue with perceived unauthorised works and an unauthorised number of pigs, currently located at the subject site. The appeal also submits that the change of agent was not undertaken under accepted protocols.
- 8.2.2. The applicant submits that the governing permission for the site includes Planning Ref. 06/368 (ACP Ref. PL.88.219326) that expressly permitted 280 sows, 900 weaners, and 1,100 fatteners or production pigs. The revised and existing layout of the piggery is clarified as being addressed under the 2006 permission. The applicant also noted that pig numbers existing on site were clarified with the Planning Authority and was accepted as part of the further information process for the subject application.
- 8.2.3. I have considered the planning history of the site as set out by both the Planning Authority in their assessment of the proposal, and the applicant as set out in their FI response and response to the appeal. Firstly, it is not a function of An Coimisiun Pleanála to pursue matters of enforcement or alleged unauthorised development, and I do not propose to do so as part of my assessment of this appeal. Ultimately, I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of permitted pig production facilities at the subject site and note specifically that the subject proposal is to demolish the existing, outdated pig housing and construct a modern, larger facility to provide for an increased number of animals. I therefore consider there to be sufficient grounds to consider the subject proposal on its own merits.
- 8.2.4. The appeal, appeal response and observations on the appeal are wide ranging and include some duplication of issues raised under various headings. I have sought to consolidate my assessment of the issues under the headings below and under my Environmental Impact Assessment Screening (Section 6) and Appropriate Assessment (Section 9) that should be read collectively.
- 8.2.5. In relation to the change of agent at Further Information stage, I am satisfied that an acceptable procedure was followed whereby the Planning Authority were notified in

writing with regard to a change of agent. I do not consider the change in agent to be a material matter in the consideration of the appeal before me.

8.3. **Scope of the Assessment**

8.3.1. The appeals and 3rd party observers highlight the need to widen the scope of assessment of the proposal to assess the impacts of slurry spreading of pig manure produced from the proposal. It is argued that no detailed information has been submitted on the locations for feedstock supply and land spreading and that, consequently, a cumulative and comprehensive assessment of the indirect impacts of the development cannot be completed.

8.3.2. I acknowledge that the applicant has provided a coded table in relation to receiving farms of produced manure, which are generally within townlands local to the subject proposal. Usefully, the applicant has identified 17 separate landholdings in the wider area, with a nutrient capacity of 4,258m³. However, given the volume of material expected (3,245m³) and the likely lifespan of the project, I consider that:

- The practicalities of identifying specific final destinations of produced slurry are infeasible and not necessary in the assessment and determination of this proposal.
- It would be unreasonable to expect that agreements with farmers would be finalised at this stage or that the slurry spreading locations would remain constant over time.
- It is a matter for another regulation system to ensure the applicant can ensure land spreading is in accordance with relevant legislation.
- There is a functional independence between the proposed development and local farm operations.

8.3.3. Although land spreading locations were requested by the Planning Authority and provided by the applicant, it was generally accepted by the PA that through the application of Good Agricultural Practice Regulations (as amended) there would be no indirect impacts from the proposal. The carrying out of land spreading does not therefore form a specified part of this application and was not conditioned by the Planning Authority in their decision on the application. The spreading of slurry from the proposed development will be a continuation of existing practices and regulated

separately. In this regard, I note that any subsequent, land spreading would be regulated by the provisions of S.I. No. 113/2022 entitled “European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2022” (as amended) (GAP Regulations 2022).

- 8.3.4. This matter was alluded to in an observation to the appeal, whereby the observer noted that an assessment of land spreading locations over the lifetime of the project is not feasible.
- 8.3.5. The spreading of organic fertilisers is managed under the GAP Regulations 2022. These regulations are for the purpose of preventing water pollution. They provide for the limitation of quantities of nitrates and phosphate that can be directly applied to land. Surface water is protected through the provision of buffers from surface water features. Groundwater is protected by the prohibition of direct discharge to groundwater and measures to prevent indirect pollution through discharge to ground and percolation through the soil. Therefore, I am satisfied, subject to the adherence to the GAP Regulations 2022, that no in-combination or cumulative impacts arise from any land spreading associated with the proposed development. I conclude that it is not necessary to carry out an assessment of the impacts of slurry spreading within a multiplicity of defined destinations and on this principle find that land spreading is regulated under a separate code and is not a matter for consideration by An Coimisiun Pleanala.
- 8.3.6. I am satisfied that the activity does not form part of the current project and that it can be appropriately controlled by the requirement for Nutrient Management Plans and compliance with the European Union (Good Agricultural Practice for the protection of waters) Regulations 2022 as set out in the submitted documentation.
- 8.3.7. Some 3rd parties have raised concerns about the potential for indirect impacts of the proposed development, including from land spreading and associated ammonia impacts. However, I am satisfied that the appeal should be assessed on the basis of the current plans and particulars and that the conditions of any grant of permission would appropriately control the operation of the development, with additional environmental controls being mandated through the Department of Agriculture and the EPA as separate consenting authorities.

8.3.8. Having regard to the above, I consider that the scope of assessment can reasonably concentrate on the direct, indirect and cumulative/in-combination impacts of the proposed development itself.

8.4. **Pig Numbers**

- 8.4.1. The submitted details within the appeal state the applicant has underestimated the capacity of the proposed pig houses with an overall capacity of over 4,000 pigs possibly being catered for within the proposal. The appeal submits this will have implications for odour, noise and environmental impacts of the proposal and therefore an EIAR should have been required and submitted by the applicant.
- 8.4.2. The first party submits that the proposal has been designed in collaboration with Teagasc modelling standards and against the Department of Agriculture Specification S.141 – Minimum specification for Pig Houses (April 2025). Furthermore, it is submitted by the applicant that conditions attached to the Cork CC grant of permission can manage the numbers of pigs within the facility to maintain effective limits.
- 8.4.3. I have had regard to the details submitted within the appeal and the response provided by the applicant. While I acknowledge in the appeal submission that there is no allowance for the intermediate growth period between 30kg to 110kg, I am mindful of on-site practices and the ultimate space requirements for 110kg pigs, which is specified as 1.1sqm per pig as set out in Table 8 of Spec. 141 by the Department of Agriculture. I note from the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended), that production pigs are any pigs over 30KG for the purposes of determining EIAR thresholds, with any number over 2,000 finisher/production pigs triggering the requirement for sub-threshold EIAR. I note the applicant does not propose to exceed 1,600 production pigs which confirms that EIAR requirements would not be triggered as the 2,000 finisher/production pig limit would not be exceeded.
- 8.4.4. I note that non-production spaces within the proposed building such as circulation spaces, passages and plant rooms can be excluded from the stocking calculations of the building and that there is an overall net production space of 2,422sqm approximately. This space is broken down to 610sqm for a proposed number of 2,000 weaner pigs and 1,812sqm for 1,600 finisher pigs. This equates to 0.3sqm per

weaner pig and 1.13sqm per finisher pig, generally in accordance with minimum standards of 0.2sqm per weaner and 1.1sqm per finisher/production pig of 110kg, as set out in Spec. 141. A minor excess of 62sqm is provided, which I consider to be acceptable in relation to additional floor space above minimum requirements and good animal health practice.

8.4.5. In relation to limits on pig numbers and triggers for EIAR, I have assessed EIAR requirements separately under Section 6.0 and the attached appendices of my report. However, the appeals raise a valid argument in relation to the discrepancy in space requirements for pigs in the 30kg-110kg bracket, that require less space and theoretically meaning that a higher number of pigs may be accommodated within the facility. I consider the space provisions as set out in Spec. 141 from the Department of Agriculture to be minimum standards as set out in the document itself and noted in the submitted details from Teagasc, that support the application. Therefore, although there are no details provided by the applicant in relation to management of pig numbers in the 30kg-110kg bracket, I consider it unreasonable for them to provide such management details in a planning application and find that once the ultimate limit of 1,600 production pigs is adhered to, the size and number of pigs above the 30kg weight bracket is irrelevant. Compliance with pig number limits can be enforced by way of conditions on overall weaners and production pigs and maintenance of incoming/outgoing pigs, made available for inspection by the Planning Authority. The applicant has indicated their support for such conditions as included on the Cork CC decision, and I recommend these are attached with any grant of permission.

8.5. **Water/Drainage Impacts**

8.5.1. The Third-Party Appeal claims that the subject proposal has the potential to impact on groundwater quality and private wells in the area.

8.5.2. I accept this issue is related to water quality impacts from the proposed development and the submitted Drainage Impact Assessment submitted by the applicant, which are also related to the Appropriate Assessment (AA) of the subject proposal on the principles of water quality maintenance. I refer the Commission to my key findings in the AA section and Water Framework (WFD) Assessment of this report for additional details in relation to water quality preservation.

8.5.3. **Purpose of WFD**

- 8.5.4. The purpose of the WFD is to ensure that no changes occur that cause a deterioration of the ecological status of any water body, and that the development does not prevent the achievement of the future status objectives of any water body. Impacts on water quality can in some instances have a knock-on effect on the appropriate assessment of the proposed development as outlined in Section 9.0 of this report.
- 8.5.5. The subject site is located entirely within the Skibereen-Clonakilty Groundwater Body (GWB) (Ref: IE_SW_G_085) and is located within the Bandon-Ilen WFD Catchment. The Skibereen-Clonakilty GWB has been assessed as having 'Good' status in the period to 2024 and is also identified as being 'Not at Risk'.
- 8.5.6. The Drainage Impact Assessment identifies the private well that serves the subject site within a 250m buffer area, a well 480m south of the site (IE_GSI_GW_Well_2453) and another 2.2km north of the site (IE_GSI_GW_Well_3335) from GSI mapping and what they consider to be under the sphere of influence of the proposal. The appeals submit that there are a number of other private wells within 200-250m of the proposal that could also be impacted and have not been assessed.
- 8.5.7. I have assessed the proposed piggery with effluent tank and slatted tank and the submitted Drainage Impact Assessment, in the context of the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological), and to prevent deterioration.
- 8.5.8. Ecological status of surface water is defined through assessment of ecological and chemical status. Ecological status relates to the biological quality elements supported by the physico-chemical elements and hydromorphology elements. Chemical status relates to the amount of priority substances and priority hazardous substances within a waterbody.
- 8.5.9. The Drainage Impact Statement submitted by the applicant confirms that in order to mitigate against potential negative effects on surface and groundwater quality, quantity and flow patterns, mitigation measures will be implemented. The main mitigation is as follows:
- Potentially polluting materials to be stored in bunded areas with 110% capacity

- Designated refuelling areas by competent personnel
- Monitoring for signs of hydrocarbon leakage
- Spill kits provided at refuelling areas
- Designated areas for cleaning and washing to prevent potential pollutants from entering surface or groundwater
- Silt traps to be installed on the laneway surface water drains to avoid silt entering soakaways.

8.5.10. During the operational phase, run off rates are to be restricted to 4/l per second, and surface water will be discharged via silt traps, attenuation tanks and onwards to suitably sized soakaways. Attenuation tanks and silt traps are proposed to prevent any sediments from entering groundwater. Soakaways will be designed to BRE Digest 365 specifications.

8.5.11. The slatted tanks will be used to collect and store foul water associated with the proposed piggery building. The slurry will be spread across third party lands and will be spread in accordance with the standard agricultural protocols which are driven by water quality regulations including the EU Good Agricultural Practice for protection of Waters Regulations 2022.

8.5.12. As noted, the GAP regulations are for the purpose of preventing water pollution. They provide for the limitation of quantities of nitrates and phosphate that can be directly applied to land. Surface water is protected through the provision of buffers from surface water features. Groundwater is protected by the prohibition of direct discharge to groundwater and measures to prevent indirect pollution through discharge to ground and percolation through the soil. Therefore, I am satisfied, subject to the adherence to the GAP Regulations 2022, that no in-combination or cumulative impacts arise from any land spreading associated with the proposed development.

8.5.13. Sanitary foul effluent will be generated by on site toilet facilities, entering a septic tank before discharge via percolation area.

8.5.14. I note the baseline water-quality testing carried out on the current water supply serving the site, with the results showing that all test parameters meet Drinking Water

Regulations and advisory limits. The applicant has submitted this as proof positive that the existing environment has been reliably measured and indicates no impacts from the existing piggery operations.

8.5.15. In having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that the proposal can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or ground waterbodies when mitigation measures are implemented. Foul water and effluent from the piggery operations will be contained in sealed underground storage tanks for off-site disposal, and although the wells submitted by the appellants may not have been assessed for impacts, I am satisfied that the proposed mitigation and containment measures are sufficient to mitigate impacts on water quality in the immediate and wider area.

8.5.16. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The proposed development does not involve any abstraction of groundwater or alteration of drainage patterns. Therefore, the available quantity/volume of groundwater and surface water will remain unaltered during the construction and operational phases.
- While there is a low risk of environmental pollutants, mitigation for the protection of surface water during construction and operational phases will ensure the qualitative status of the receiving waters will not be altered.
- Filtration and absorption capacity of grasslands surrounding the subject site.
- There is also mitigation proposed to protect groundwater quality during the construction and operational phases of the development including soak pits, silt traps and limiting drainage 4/l per second.

8.5.17. I have taken into account the PA Environment Section assessment of the subject proposal, which they conclude can comply with Good Agricultural Practice regulations. Further reference is made to the GAP regulations in the form of controlling when, where, and how slurry and soiled water can be applied to the land and, the level of chemical fertilisers which can be applied to the holding. It is noted all farm operators are required to comply with these regulations.

8.5.18. I recommend additional standard conditions to be attached to any grant or permission, that would ensure compliance with water protection standards. I do not

identify any requirement for a bunded area to store pollutant materials on the submitted plans and therefore see no requirement for a condition ensuring correct implementation of such a measure, as was included on the PA decision. Adequate standard mitigation measures in relation to prevention of hydrocarbon spillages would be sufficient to reduce the low risk of such incidents.

8.6. Traffic Impacts

- 8.6.1. Observers to the appeal and the appeals themselves raise a number of concerns in relation to the traffic and transport assessment and submit that the traffic impact is underrepresented in the assessment provided by the applicant. It is submitted that the road network in the surrounding area would be negatively impacted by the number and frequency of HGV trips on the network and local junction/road upgrades are not adequate to safely cater for the predicted additional traffic. The Planning Authority District Engineer had no objection to the proposed development subject to the proposed measures submitted which include setback gate entrance, drainage and sightlines at the proposed entrance.
- 8.6.2. I have examined, analysed and evaluated all of the associated documentation and submissions on file in respect of traffic and transportation. I am satisfied that the applicant's presented baseline environment is comprehensive and that the key impacts in respect of likely effects on the local road network and surrounding environment, as a consequence of the development have been identified.
- 8.6.3. In relation to the traffic arising from the proposed development, and its impact on the local road network, the results of the assessment provided confirm that the surveyed junctions in the vicinity of the site would remain operating within capacity post development in the opening, design and future-year scenarios.
- 8.6.4. I note that the existing level of traffic on the local road network is low and the majority of HGV/Tanker movements relate to delivery/extraction of pigs and collection of slurry. A total of 1-2 vehicle trips per day are forecast, which is 1% of existing road traffic on the surrounding network.
- 8.6.5. Having regard to the above, I consider that the predicted traffic movements set out in the submitted documents are reasonable. I consider that there is significant spare capacity in the road network, that any likely increase in estimated volumes could be

satisfactorily accommodated, and that further assessment is not required in relation to the road network.

8.6.6. Regarding the travel routes to and from the subject site, I again note that the submitted details set out a clear intention that collection/delivery vehicles will be via lightly trafficked roads and will either travel east (1 trip) and west (2 trips) when existing the facility. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the source and destination routes associated with the proposed development will not generate a significant level of traffic so as to make the local road network unsafe.

8.6.7. In conclusion, I consider that the application clearly outlines the existing traffic conditions at the site and reasonably predicts that the impact of the proposed development and wider traffic growth will not result in a cumulative adverse impact on traffic and transport. I am satisfied that the impacts that are predicted to arise in relation to traffic and transport are acceptable having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development within a rural area. I have considered all the information on file, including submissions received and the information contained in the submitted traffic assessment. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that impacts predicted to arise in relation to traffic and transport would be avoided, managed, and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme and through suitable conditions where appropriate. I am, therefore, satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable impacts in terms of traffic and transport.

8.7. Residential Amenity Impacts

8.7.1. Outside of potential impacts from traffic and water quality as already addressed, Human Health impacts raised in the appeals relate to odour impacts and noise impacts, with some reference in the appeals to visual impact and impacts from vermin and other waste management issues at the proposed piggery. I shall deal with each separately.

Air and Odour

8.7.2. The appeal and observations to the appeal, raise a number of concerns in relation to the odour assessment undertaken by the applicant. The appeal submits that the odour from an increased number of pigs will have a significant negative impact on residential amenity. The appeal states the odour impact assessment does not include

adequate data on ammonia emissions and the odour assessment itself is not sufficient based primarily on an inadequate assessment of pig numbers, which I have already addressed and considered acceptable.

- 8.7.3. The submitted details include an Odour assessment of the potential impacts from the emissions on the nearest residential properties (14no. receptors). A separate Ammonia Impact Assessment was also submitted that included review of impacts on sensitive receptors at 8 no. European sites.
- 8.7.4. Each assessment provided a review of meteorological data, local terrain and land use, potential emissions including downwash from buildings, numbers and types of pigs and anticipated emission rates.
- 8.7.5. I am satisfied that use of existing air quality information based on similar locations sourced from EPA data to allow for modelling of future scenarios would allow for the impacts of the project on odour, ammonia and nitrogen emissions to be predicted in a reasonable manner. A dispersion modelling assessment is included to predict the impact and allow for comparison to an appropriate odour annoyance criterion and the relevant ambient air quality standards outlined in the EPA's instruction note for the assessment of odour emissions from intensive agriculture pig installations (EPA, 2022) and the EPA Air Dispersion Modelling Guidance Note (AG4), (EPA, 2020). A detailed Dispersion Modelling Assessment (CALPUFF) is also used to predict the emission levels.
- 8.7.6. The odour modelling assessment found that the predicted concentrations of odour at all sensitive receptors are under EPA limits and, therefore, comply with odour criterion recommended by the EPA for new pig farms at 3.00UE/m³.
- 8.7.7. A Stepwise procedure was used to assess ammonia and nitrogen impacts on the following sensitive locations:
- Bandon River SAC
 - Castletownshend SAC
 - Clonakilty Bay SAC and SPA
 - Myross Wood SAC
 - Galley Head to Dundeen Point SPA or the Kilkeran Lake

- Castlefreke Dunes SAC
- Seven Heads SPA

8.7.8. For the proposed development Step 1 of the stepwise assessment indicated background levels of ammonia and nitrogen were in exceedance of the critical levels at nearby Natura 2000 sites. Accordingly, the assessment skipped to step 4, where a modelled assessment is required, which concluded the potential impact of ammonia and nitrogen deposition are below evaluation criteria of <1% of the critical level for ammonia and for the critical load for nitrogen deposition.

8.7.9. I consider that the air and odour impact at operational stage have been suitably identified and mitigated and that these impacts will be satisfactorily controlled through the provision of enclosed underground slurry tanks and provision of ventilation fans on the roofs of buildings to dissipate odour levels. Odour impacts are below the recommended limit of 3.0OUE/m³, in some instances by as much as 2.8 as evidenced by a 5-year maximum of 0.2 at DR10 as contained in the assessment. DR1 has a 5 year maximum of 2.4 which is the worst case scenario at the sensitive receptors modelled, but is considerably below the identified threshold, and notably is the closest dwelling to the existing facility. Ammonia and nitrogen emissions have been adequately addressed, and I am satisfied these are less than the 1% recommended level for critical levels and load respectively.

8.7.10. I am satisfied that the impacts that are predicted to arise in relation to air quality and odour are acceptable having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development. I have considered all the information on file, including submissions received and the information contained in the submitted assessments. Having regard to the above, I am satisfied that impacts predicted to arise in relation to air quality and odour are within applicable limits as set out in the 2022 EPA Instruction Note on Intensive pig farms and can be managed and mitigated by the measures which form part of the proposed scheme and through suitable conditions. I am, therefore, satisfied that the proposed development would not have any unacceptable direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts in terms of air quality and odour at the surrounding sensitive receptors.

Noise

- 8.7.11. The appeals and observations set out that an inadequate noise assessment has been undertaken by the applicant, choice of plant has not been confirmed, and a single 24-hour survey period is not sufficient to determine the noise impact from the facility at peak times. It is also submitted that incorrect pig numbers were used in the noise assessment, which I have addressed earlier in my report.
- 8.7.12. The applicant has submitted that a valid noise impact assessment was submitted to the Planning Authority who accepted the findings that all noise sensitive receptors would be well within acceptable limits following the implementation of the proposal.
- 8.7.13. I note the submitted noise impact assessment that included noise monitoring to quantify ambient noise levels, predicted maximum operational noise emission criteria based on best practice, operational noise emission levels based on various mitigating factors such as separation distances and screening from buildings, and an assessment of cumulative impacts. All noise predictions were done in accordance with ISO 9613: Acoustics – Attenuation of sound outdoors, Part 2: General method of calculation, 1996 and noise monitoring was done in accordance with ISO 1996: 2016: Acoustics – Description, measurement and assessment of environmental noise.
- 8.7.14. I note that noise emissions from the piggery were observed to be inaudible at the identified noise monitoring location, on the boundary with the nearest residential dwelling. I find this to be indicative, and I note from my visit to the site, the very low level of noise from the existing structures. Noise levels were measured by the applicant at an average of 40dB during daytime and 38dB at night time.
- 8.7.15. Applying factored reductions to noise limits as a result of windows/walls within houses, a daytime limit of 50db was derived and 45db for nighttime. Noise impacts from piggery house livestock, ventilation fans, feeding systems, feed delivery truck events and a cumulative assessment of all noise levels was undertaken. Cumulative noise levels of 27-32db were predicted by the applicant for each of the nearest dwellings surrounding the appeal site. This is considerably below maximum noise limits of 50db and 45db for day and nighttime respectively.
- 8.7.16. I have examined, analysed and evaluated the submitted noise assessment details, all of the associated documentation and submissions on file in respect of noise impacts. I am satisfied that the applicant's presented baseline environment, is comprehensive

and that the key impacts in respect of likely effects on noise, as a consequence of the development have been identified.

8.7.17. The residential and noise sensitive receptors have been addressed in the noise impact assessment and the nature of the proposed development is such that following the construction phase it would not result in substantive increases in noise levels in the area, other than via increased traffic, which the applicant has accounted for as part of their noise impact assessment and would be intermittent and temporary for a low level of overall traffic. I consider the impact of an increased number of pigs at this location is adequately included in the forecast noise levels provided and accept that due to separation distances involved to NSLs, that noise impacts would be negligible.

Visual Impact

8.7.18. Visual amenity impact was raised by the appellants. The proposal is categorised as an 'eyesore' in the appeals due to the scale and location of the proposal.

8.7.19. Having considered the overall design of the proposal including the proposed landscaping, the inclusion of 1.5m high mounds to the east, south and west, the existing strand of mature trees to the north, coupled with the proposed biodiversity led planting at the site boundaries, I consider this sufficient mitigation to screen views of the subject proposal, as well as further mitigate the minimal noise impacts.

8.7.20. The design of the proposal is an enhancement of the existing outdated structures on site and the proposed materials are typical of agricultural buildings across the country with a combination of concrete and green coloured aluminium cladding. I therefore find that the proposal will not be visually intrusive on the landscape and is appropriate at this location.

Vermin and Other Pest Control

8.7.21. My final point in relation to human health impacts was raised in the appeals as potential for increased vermin infestation, mould, insects or other infestations. I note the proposal for operation of livestock facilities must comply with animal health and biosecurity measures regulated by the Department of Agriculture. The proposed design incorporates modern ventilation systems, sealed storage, and waste management procedures that minimise the risk of nuisance or infestation. The PA

decision added conditions to their decision to further safeguard public health and environmental quality. I am therefore satisfied that through the addition of appropriate conditions, the risk to human health in relation to vermin and waste management can be adequately mitigated and do not find a reason for refusal in this regard.

Residential Amenity Impact Conclusion

8.7.22. Based on the details provided in relation to odour emissions, predicted noise levels emanating from the proposal, visual appearance of the proposed development and control of other possibilities of infestation and public health I am satisfied that relevant limits would not be exceeded by the overall proposal. Odour impacts would remain below 3.0 O_μ3/m³ at sensitive receptors, noise impacts would be low and can be further managed by way of condition, the proposal would be effectively screened by proposed mounding and planting at the boundaries of the proposal and environmental management of on-site operations can appropriately mitigate any potential for operational nuisances, in line with best agricultural practice.

8.8. Ecology

8.8.1. The appellants submit that an insufficient ecological and biodiversity assessment of the proposal has been submitted, including inadequate bat surveys and an unacceptable contribution to biodiversity from the proposal.

8.8.2. The applicant provides that the bat survey work is consistent with accepted standards, indicated limited use of the site for bats, with no roosting activity identified and was acceptable to the Planning Authority. Bird nest boxes, bat boxes, ecological supervision where appropriate and a biodiversity led landscape plan for the site also provide that ecological impacts from the site will provide a net positive at this location.

8.8.3. I have had regard to all of the associated documentation and submissions on file in respect of ecology and biodiversity. I am satisfied that the applicant's presented baseline environment, is comprehensive and that the key impacts in respect of likely effects on biodiversity, as a consequence of the development have been identified. Parties to the application have raised a number of issues in respect of biodiversity at various stages of the application and appeal process, which I address below:

- Adequacy of Surveys;

- Cumulative Impacts and impacts of land-spreading
- Incomplete biodiversity measures proposed for the site.

- 8.8.4. The appeal states that the surveys provided are inadequate as they were not complete during a typical bat season of May-September. The survey details within the submitted Bird and Bat Report provide results from February and Early May 2025. The submitted AA Screening report appropriately provides an analysis of the qualifying interests of European Sites, which includes any hydrological connections. Bird and Bat Surveys undertaken by the applicant provide a clear picture in relation to existing habitats, including bird and bat species, to allow a full assessment of impact to be undertaken.
- 8.8.5. The appeal claims the AA Screening Report does not account for full impacts on European sites and that an NIS should have been submitted to cover and provide details for accidental spill, increased nutrient loads, surface water run-off, or the long-term impacts of land spreading. I have undertaken a full assessment of appropriate assessment requirements in section 9.0 of this report and provide my conclusions in relation to land spreading above, however for the purposes of the ecology matters, the other points raised in the appeal are also valid and I address each in turn below.
- 8.8.6. In relation to mitigation measures that prevent impacts on surface water, the applicant provides a range of measures aimed at containing any accidental spillages on site including bunded areas, contained storage tanks, attenuation tanks with impermeable membrane and spill kit measures. The site is not prone to flooding and therefore the likelihood of inundation and increased surface run off is low.
- 8.8.7. The site is not hydrologically connected to any watercourse and is over 1km west of the Owenahinchy River that drains to the Rosscarbery Estuary.
- 8.8.8. I consider land-spreading to be an indirect impact that does not form part of the application for consent in this instance and as detailed earlier in my report. Land-spreading at receiving farms will be managed by Good Agricultural Practice Guidelines at individual farms and I consider this to be an appropriate mechanism to manage nutrient loads in the receiving locality. Details provided by the applicant indicate sufficient nutrient capacity at existing receiving farms and I am satisfied that is sufficient detail for this level of planning assessment.

- 8.8.9. The appeal claims there was inadequate provision of biodiversity measures in the subject proposal. The submitted landscape plan provides a range of measures at the subject site including bat boxes, bird nesting boxes (within existing Leylandi trees), native landscape planting around the proposed structures and along the access lane that will be of benefit to local biodiversity and which I consider acceptable. I note the proposal includes retention of existing Leylandi trees along the northern boundary. The proposed percolation area and soakaway drainage pipes are proposed in this area. Tree and root protection measures will be required to maintain these trees post-construction and in this regard, I consider it appropriate to include conditions on any grant of permission to ensure their ongoing protection during works.
- 8.8.10. In relation to cumulative impacts, I consider that in the absence of any physical pathway and the implementation of standard water quality mitigation measures, will result in the current application having no cumulative impacts upon European Sites in an identified zone of influence, including the Kilkeran Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC, which is the closest European site at approximately 3.5km south. The appellants refer to the absence of the 'precautionary principle' in the assessment of the subject proposal, whereby if there is doubt in relation to the impacts of a proposal on a European Site, permission should be refused. While a full Appropriate Assessment screening assessment is undertaken in this report separately, I am satisfied there is no doubt in relation to the impacts of the proposal on biodiversity, which can be adequately mitigated through the measures put forward in the subject proposal

9.0 AA Screening

- 9.1.1. Having reviewed the details on file and having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development, the location of the site within a rural area, the absence of strong ecological and/ or hydrological connections, and the physical separation distances to European Sites, I consider the potential of likely significant effects on European Sites arising from the proposed development, alone or in combination effects, can be reasonably excluded.
- 9.1.2. The spreading of organic fertilisers is managed under the GAP Regulations 2022. These regulations are for the purpose of preventing water pollution. They provide for

the limitation of quantities of nitrates and phosphate that can be directly applied to land. Surface water is protected through the provision of buffers from surface water features. Groundwater is protected by the prohibition of direct discharge to groundwater and measures to prevent indirect pollution through discharge to ground and percolation through the soil. Therefore, I am satisfied, subject to the adherence to the GAP Regulations 2022, that no in-combination or cumulative impacts arise from any land spreading associated with the proposed development. Reliance on the GAP Regulations for the control of land spreading is not a mitigation measure for the purpose of preventing a significant effect on any European Site as this is governed by regulation and applies to all land where spreading takes place, to prevent pollution to surface water and groundwater.

9.1.3. Please refer to the attached appendices for detailed Stage 1 Appropriate Assessment.

10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1.1. 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 based on the mitigation measures, drainage arrangements and management of surface water as set out in the proposed development. Please see WFD Assessment attached at Appendix 3 of this report.

11.0 Recommendation

11.1.1. I recommend that permission for the development be granted for the following reasons and considerations.

12.0 Reasons and Considerations

12.1.1. Having regard to:

- (a) the established use of the appeal site as a piggery,
- (b) its location in a rural area, generally removed from residential development,

(c) the nature of the proposal which is to provide for animal welfare and good environmental management of the facility,

(d) the fact that the proposed development will be subject to Department of Agriculture regulation, and

(e) the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028,

It is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the area or property in the vicinity, would not give rise to an undue risk of water pollution, would not be prejudicial to public health and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

13.0 Conditions

1.	<p>The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of clarity.</p>
2.	<p>The maximum pig numbers maintained on site shall not exceed 2,000 weaners and 1,600 finishers/production pigs.</p> <p>Reason: To control the volume of effluent generated by the development and in the interests of environmental protection.</p>
3.	<p>The pig herd operator shall maintain records on site recording;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• number and weight of pigs entering facility on a monthly basis,• number and weight of pigs leaving facility on a monthly basis,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number and type of pigs on hands (weaners and finishers) at the end of each month. <p>Records shall be available for inspection by authorised officers of the Planning Authority at all reasonable times.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of orderly development and environmental protection.</p>
4.	<p>During the construction phase noise levels emanating from the proposed development when measured at specified noise sensitive locations shall not exceed 55 dBA (30 minute Leq) between 08.00 hours and 22.00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive and shall not exceed 45 dBA (15 minute Leq) at any other time.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area.</p>
5.	<p>All mitigation measures set out in the Noise Impact Assessment lodged with the Planning Authority shall be implemented in full to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and to protect the physical environment.</p>
6.	<p>Noise levels emanating from the proposed development following commissioning, when measured externally at specified noise sensitive locations, shall not exceed 43 dB(A), or a maximum increase of 5 dB(A) above background noise.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area.</p>
7.	<p>All odour reduction techniques set out in the Odour Impact Assessment lodged with the Planning Authority shall be implemented ensuring compliance with the odour criterion recommended by EPA for new pig farms of 3.0 oug/m³ at all sensitive receptor locations to the full satisfaction of the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area.</p>

8.	<p>Details of the materials, colours and textures of all the external finishes to the proposed development, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.</p>
9.	<p>Sightlines shall be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Sight distance triangles shall be maintained and kept free from vegetation or other obstructions that would reduce the minimum visibility required.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of traffic safety.</p>
10.	<p>The site shall be landscaped in accordance with a comprehensive scheme of landscaping, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This scheme shall include the following:</p> <p>(a) A plan to scale of not less than 1:500 showing –</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Existing trees and hedgerows, specifying which are proposed for retention as features of the site landscaping and which are being replaced</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii) The measures to be put in place for the protection of relevant landscape features during the construction period</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(iii) The species, variety, number, size and locations of all proposed trees and shrubs which shall comprise predominantly native species such as mountain ash, birch, willow, sycamore, pine, oak, hawthorn, holly, hazel, beech or alder and which shall not include prunus species</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(iv) Details of new screen planting which shall not include cupressocyparis x leylandii</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(v) Details of roadside/street planting which shall not include prunus species</p> <p>(c) A timescale for implementation</p> <p>All planting shall be adequately protected from damage until established. Any plants which die, are removed or become seriously</p>

	<p>damaged or diseased, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to assimilate the proposal into the surrounding rural landscape, to provide biodiversity and in the interest of visual amenity.</p>
11.	<p>Nest boxes shall be provided within the site in accordance with submitted plans and particulars and under the supervision of a suitably qualified ecologist.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of biodiversity.</p>
12.	<p>Prior the commencement of works, trees and buildings with bat roosting potential shall be surveyed by a suitably qualified Ecologist who is appropriately qualified and experienced in undertaking bat surveys and in line with best practice at the appropriate time of year to confirm the absence of roosting bats. In the event that a previously undetected bat roost is identified and is likely to be disturbed, the applicant shall acquire a derogation under Regulation 54 of the European Communities (Bird and Natural Habitats) Regulations 2011 prior to the commencement of the relevant works. Prior to the removal of trees and/or works to building, the bat survey results, methodologies for felling/works and any derogations shall be submitted for the written agreement of the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of wildlife protection.</p>
13.	<p>(a) The septic tank/wastewater treatment system hereby permitted shall be installed in accordance with the recommendations included within the site characterisation report submitted with this application and shall be in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(b) Treated effluent from the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system shall be discharged to a percolation area/ polishing filter which shall be provided</p>

	<p>in accordance with the standards set out in the document entitled “Code of Practice - Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10)” – Environmental Protection Agency, 2021.</p> <p>(c) Within three months of the first occupation of the dwelling, the developer shall submit a report to the planning authority from a suitably qualified person (with professional indemnity insurance) certifying that the septic tank/ wastewater treatment system and associated works is constructed and operating in accordance with the standards set out in the Environmental Protection Agency document referred to above.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to prevent water pollution.</p>
14.	<p>Water supply and drainage arrangements, including the attenuation and disposal of surface water shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure a proper standard of development.</p>
15.	<p>Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0800 to 1900 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities of property in the vicinity.</p>
16.	<p>The construction of the development shall be managed in accordance with a Construction and Environmental Management Plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall incorporate all the construction stage mitigation measures outlined in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and Natura Impact Statement, and shall provide details of intended construction practice for the development, including and not limited to:</p>

- (a) location of the site and materials compound(s) including area(s) identified for the storage of construction refuse,
- (b) location of areas for construction site offices and staff facilities,
- (c) details of site security fencing and hoardings,
- (d) details of car parking facilities for site workers during the course of construction,
- (e) details of the timing and routing of construction traffic to and from the construction site and associated directional signage, to include proposals to facilitate the delivery of abnormal loads to the site if required,
- (f) measures to obviate queuing of construction traffic on the adjoining road network,
- (g) measures to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble, or other debris on the public road network,
- (h) alternative arrangements to be put in place for pedestrians and vehicles in the case of the closure of any public road or footpath during the course of site development works,
- (i) details of appropriate mitigation measures for noise, dust and vibration, and monitoring of such levels,
- (j) containment of all construction-related fuel and oil within specially constructed bunds to ensure that fuel spillages are fully contained. Such bunds shall be roofed to exclude rainwater,
- (k) details of construction lighting,
- (l) details of key construction management personnel to be employed in the development, and
- (m) Means to ensure that surface water run-off is controlled such that no silt or other pollutants enter local surface water sewers or drains.

A record of daily checks that the works are being undertaken in accordance with the Construction Management Plan and monitoring results as appropriate shall be kept for inspection by the planning authority.

	<p>Reason: In the interest of amenities, environmental protection, public health, and safety.</p>
17.	<p>Construction and demolition waste shall be managed in accordance with a construction waste and demolition management plan, which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development. This plan shall be prepared in accordance with the “Best Practice Guidelines on the Preparation of Waste Management Plans for Construction and Demolition Projects”, published by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government in July 2006.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of sustainable waste management.</p>
18.	<p>All solid wastes arising on the site shall be recycled as far as possible. Materials exported from the site for recovery, recycling or disposal shall be managed at an approved facility and in such a manner as is agreed with the Planning Authority. In any case no such wastes shall be stored on the site except within the confines of the buildings on site. Adequate on-site arrangements for the storage of recyclable materials prior to collection shall be made to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area.</p>
19.	<p>Lighting shall be provided in accordance with a scheme, details of which shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development. The scheme shall minimise obtrusive light outside the boundaries of the development at all times.</p> <p>Reason: In the interest of amenity and public safety.</p>
20.	<p>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</p>

planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or, in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

Reason: It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

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.

Matthew McRedmond
Senior Planning Inspector

05th May 2026

Appendix 1: Form 1 EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	PL-500735-WC-26
Proposed Development Summary	Demolition of existing piggery accommodating 1,250 pigs (500 weaning and 750 production pigs) and construction of replacement piggery complex for 2,000 weaning pigs and 1,600 production pigs.
Development Address	Drryduff, Rosscarberry, 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)	If a development is not a project -

<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>State the Class here</p>
<p><input checked="" 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 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>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold:</p> <p>Schedule 5, Part 2(1)(e)(ii):</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><i>Installations for intensive rearing of pigs not included in Part 1 of this Schedule which would have more than 2,000 places for production pigs (over 30 kilograms) in a finishing unit, more than 400 places for sows in a breeding unit or more than 200 places for sows in an integrated unit.</i></p> <p>The subject proposal is for not more than 1,600 production pigs over 30kg and is there below the stated threshold.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</p>
<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 2: Form 3 - EIA Screening Determination Form

A. CASE DETAILS		
An Bord Pleanála Case Reference	PL-500735-WC-26	
Development Summary	Permission to demolish existing piggery complex, and construct replacement piggery complex.	
	Yes / No / N/A	Comment (if relevant)
1. Was a Screening Determination carried out by the PA?	Yes	Following receipt of further Information, the PA concluded that a sub-threshold EIAR was not required.
2. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?	Yes	EIA Screening Report submitted by the applicant at FI stage
3. Has an AA screening report or NIS been submitted?	Yes	AA Screening Report
4. Is a IED/ IPC or Waste Licence (or review of licence) required from the EPA? If YES has the EPA commented on the need for an EIAR?	No.	
5. Have any other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment which have a significant bearing on the project been	N/A	

carried out pursuant to other relevant Directives – for example SEA			
B. EXAMINATION	Yes/ No/ Uncertain	Briefly describe the nature and extent and Mitigation Measures (where relevant) (having regard to the probability, magnitude (including population size affected), complexity, duration, frequency, intensity, and reversibility of impact) Mitigation measures –Where relevant specify features or measures proposed by the applicant to avoid or prevent a significant effect.	Is this likely to result in significant effects on the environment? Yes/ No/ Uncertain
This screening examination should be read with, and in light of, the rest of the Inspector’s Report attached herewith			
1. Characteristics of proposed development (including demolition, construction, operation, or decommissioning)			
1.1 Is the project significantly different in character or scale to the existing surrounding or environment?	No	The proposed piggery would replace an existing facility and is located within agricultural land. The proposal involves demolition of an existing piggery accommodating 1,250 pigs (500 weaning and 750 production pigs) and construction of replacement piggery complex for 2,000 weaning pigs and 1,600 production pigs. While there is an increase in pig numbers the overall scale of the proposal is generally consistent. I have also given consideration to sub-	No

		threshold requirements in relation to production pig numbers that would trigger a sub-threshold EIAR and I am satisfied that at 1,600 production pigs, an EIAR is not required.	
1.2 Will construction, operation, decommissioning or demolition works cause physical changes to the locality (topography, land use, waterbodies)?	No	Demolition of existing complex and construction of the new complex will take place entirely within curtilage of already developed site.	No.
1.3 Will construction or operation of the project use natural resources such as land, soil, water, materials/minerals or energy, especially resources which are non-renewable or in short supply?	Yes	Construction and operation of the proposed development will utilise natural resources such as water and energy.	No. No undisturbed ground will be developed. Construction will involve typical building materials, timber and metal which can be recycled. Additional demand for water during operation.
1.4 Will the project involve the use, storage, transport, handling or production of substance which would be harmful to human health or the environment?	Yes	Demolition impacts must be assessed. Plant and equipment emissions and airborne dust must be assessed also. Additional process emissions to air from the proposed development with increased pig numbers.	No. Odour Impact Assessment provided that indicates odour levels will be

			<p>below acceptable levels of 3.0ou£/m2 at sensitive receptors.</p> <p>CEMP will set out relevant construction mitigation measures. Standard construction measures to be used.</p>
<p>1.5 Will the project produce solid waste, release pollutants or any hazardous / toxic / noxious substances?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The construction and operation of the proposal will generate solid waste.</p>	<p>No. Waste will be managed by best practices during construction. Operational phase will be managed by a site waste management plan and agricultural best practices.</p>
<p>1.6 Will the project lead to risks of contamination of land or water from releases of pollutants onto the ground or into surface waters, groundwater, coastal waters or the sea?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>There will be no process waste water from the site.</p> <p>Pig slurry will be used for land spreading.</p>	<p>No. Land spreading to be determined based on soil nutrient status in terms of phosphorous.</p>

			Limits of 170kg/ha apply as well as an approved nutrient management plan
1.7 Will the project cause noise and vibration or release of light, heat, energy or electromagnetic radiation?	Yes	<p>During the construction and operational phases, the project will have the potential to generate pollution or potential nuisance associated with Air, Noise and Traffic.</p> <p>Operational noise from equipment and machinery also possible.</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Best practice methods will be utilised during construction to mitigate potential impacts from pollution on the local environment.</p> <p>There will be some potential for short-term noise and vibration and dust impacts during construction. Prevention measures to reduce nuisance have been set out in the CEMP, that accompanies the planning application.</p>

			Operational noise expected to be minimal due to location and plant selection.
1.8 Will there be any risks to human health, for example due to water contamination or air pollution?	Yes	There will be odour and ammonia emissions produced during the operational stages of the piggery. Asbestos has been identified in buildings to be demolished.	No. Odour concentrations below EPA limits of 3.0 OUE/m ³ . Ammonia does not exceed relevant thresholds (1%) at any modelled receptors. Asbestos to be removed by licenced contractor.
1.9 Will there be any risk of major accidents that could affect human health or the environment?	No	Some risk to human health associated with construction phase activities. This will be managed through standard on site health and safety practices. No major accident hazards associated with proposal.	No
1.10 Will the project affect the social environment (population, employment)	Yes	Potential impacts due to odour nuisance.	No. Appropriate air and odour

			concentration assessment provided that states concentrations are below EPA limits.
1.11 Is the project part of a wider large scale change that could result in cumulative effects on the environment?	No		No
2. Location of proposed development			
2.1 Is the proposed development located on, in, adjoining or have the potential to impact on any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - European site (SAC/ SPA/ pSAC/ pSPA) - NHA/ pNHA - Designated Nature Reserve - Designated refuge for flora or fauna - Place, site or feature of ecological interest, the preservation/conservation/ protection of which is an objective of a development plan/ LAP/ draft plan or variation of a plan 	No	The proposed development is not located within or bordering a designated area. An Appropriate Assessment on designated sites within 15km has been carried out. No significant effects on these sites were found. Land use surrounding the site comprises managed agricultural land.	No
2.2 Could any protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna which use areas on or around the site, for example: for breeding, nesting, foraging, resting, over-	No	There are no important or sensitive species which are known to be present in the area. Land use surrounding the site comprises managed agricultural land.	No

wintering, or migration, be affected by the project?		An AA Screening report and bat and Bird Report have been completed, determining that no evidence of bat or critical bird usage was identified at the proposed development site. Ecological is assessed as low.	
2.3 Are there any other features of landscape, historic, archaeological, or cultural importance that could be affected?	No	<p>The proposal will take place within the curtilage of an existing well established piggery. Views will be similar to the existing complex.</p> <p>Screening will be provided by existing trees to north. Native planting is proposed to east, south and west of site.</p> <p>2 ringforts and a standing stone are located approximately 2-300 metres southeast and southwest of the site. Archaeology not anticipated to be impacted given disturbed nature of ground conditions.</p>	No. Viewpoints not effected beyond existing scenario.
2.4 Are there any areas on/around the location which contain important, high quality or scarce resources which could be affected by the project, for example: forestry, agriculture, water/coastal, fisheries, minerals?	No	The submitted ecology reports have considered the baseline habitats of the receiving environment, and it is considered that subject to implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed development will not result in any significant impacts on the integrity of natural habitats.	No

2.5 Are there any water resources including surface waters, for example: rivers, lakes/ponds, coastal or groundwaters which could be affected by the project, particularly in terms of their volume and flood risk?	No	Foul and surface water management can be adequately managed through the measures outlined in the application.	No
2.6 Is the location susceptible to subsidence, landslides or erosion?	No		No
2.7 Are there any key transport routes(eg National primary Roads) on or around the location which are susceptible to congestion or which cause environmental problems, which could be affected by the project?	No	Primarily rural area	No
2.8 Are there existing sensitive land uses or community facilities (such as hospitals, schools etc) which could be affected by the project?	No	Some dispersed housing in the area but removed from site which is an existing piggery.	No

3. Any other factors that should be considered which could lead to environmental impacts

3.1 Cumulative Effects: Could this project together with existing and/or approved development result in cumulative effects during the construction/ operation phase?	No	Cumulative impacts with other development permitted and applied for in the area have been considered and are not likely to give rise to significant impacts	No
3.2 Transboundary Effects: Is the project likely to lead to transboundary effects?	No	N/A	No
3.3 Are there any other relevant considerations?	No		

C. CONCLUSION

No real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Not Required
Real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>	EIAR Required

D. MAIN REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

EG - EIAR not Required

Having regard to: -

1. the criteria set out in Schedule 7, in particular
 - (a) the **limited** nature and scale of the proposed **piggery** development, **in an established agricultural area already the site of an established piggery**
 - (b) the absence of any significant environmental sensitivity in the vicinity, **and the proposed mitigation measures to be provided as part of the proposed development**
 - (c) the location of the development **outside of any sensitive location specified in article 109(4)(a) of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)**
2. the results of other relevant assessments of the effects on the environment submitted by the applicant
3. the features and measures proposed by applicant envisaged to avoid or prevent what might otherwise have been significant effects on the environment, and in particular the **proposal to limit the number of production/finisher pigs to 1,600, the management of odour and noise impacts, the biodiversity measures proposed and the limited level of traffic to be generated by the proposal**

The Commission concluded that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment, and that an environmental impact assessment report is not required.

Inspector _____

Date _____

Approved (DP/ADP) _____

Date _____

Appendix 3: AA Screening Determination

Test for likely significant effects

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics				
Brief description of project	Demolition of existing piggery accommodating 1,250 pigs (500 weaning and 750 production pigs) and construction of replacement piggery complex for 2,000 weaning pigs and 1,600 production pigs.			
Brief description of development of site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	Existing piggery to be demolished on 0.5ha site. Overall site approximately 19h of improved agricultural grassland. Site in developed state, existing natural boundaries, located c. 3.5km to European site, potential impact on ground water from effluent disposal and disposal of surface water, significant amount of native planting proposed. Kilkeran Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC (Site Code:001061), approx. 3.5km to southwest. The nearest part of Clonakilty Bay SPA (Site Code 004081) is approx. 5.8km southeast			
Screening report	Yes.			
Natura Impact Statement	No.			
Relevant submissions	Submissions and appeals note that an inadequate assessment of environmental impacts was submitted and impacts on European sites were not accurately quantified.			
Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model				
Eight European sites are identified as being located within a potential zone of influence of the proposed development as detailed in Table 1 below. I note that no further range of European Sites is necessary for consideration in relation to this proposed development.				
Table 1:				
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation	Distance from proposed	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N

	objectives (NPWS, date)	development (km)		
Kilkeran Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC (001061)	<p>Coastal lagoons [1150]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130]</p> <p>Kilkeran Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>	3.5km southwest	Yes, potential surface water run off to SAC and potential nitrogen and ammonia emissions to air.	Y
Clonakilty Bay SAC (Site Code 000091)	<p>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]</p> <p>Annual vegetation of drift lines [1210]</p> <p>Embryonic shifting dunes [2110]</p> <p>Shifting dunes along the shoreline with <i>Ammophila arenaria</i> (white dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Fixed coastal dunes with herbaceous vegetation (grey dunes) [2130]</p> <p>Atlantic decalcified fixed dunes (<i>Calluno-Ulicetea</i>) [2150]</p> <p>Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>	5.7km southeast	Yes. Potential nitrogen and ammonia emissions to air.	Y
Myross Wood SAC (Site Code 001070)	Vandenboschia speciosa (Killarney Fern) [6985]	11.1km southwest	Yes. Potential nitrogen and	Y

	Myross Wood SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service		ammonia emissions to air.	
Bandon River SAC (Site Code 002171)	<p>Water courses of plain to montane levels with the Ranunculus fluitans and Callitriche-Batrachion vegetation [3260]</p> <p>Alluvial forests with Alnus glutinosa and Fraxinus excelsior (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae) [91E0]</p> <p>Margaritifera margaritifera (Freshwater Pearl Mussel) [1029]</p> <p>Lampetra planeri (Brook Lamprey) [1096]</p> <p>Bandon River SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>	13.5km north	Yes. Potential nitrogen and ammonia emissions to air.	Y
Castletownshend SAC (Site Code 001547)	<p>Vandenboschia speciosa (Killarney Fern) [6985]</p> <p>Castletownshend SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>	13.9km southwest	Yes. Potential nitrogen and ammonia emissions to air.	Y
Clonakilty Bay SPA (Site Code 004081)	<p>Shelduck (Tadorna tadorna) [A048]</p> <p>Dunlin (Calidris alpina) [A149]</p> <p>Black-tailed Godwit (Limosa limosa) [A156]</p> <p>Curlew (Numenius arquata) [A160]</p> <p>Wetland and Waterbirds [A999]</p> <p>Clonakilty Bay SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service</p>	5.8km southeast	Yes. Potential nitrogen and ammonia emissions to air.	Y
Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA (Site Code 004190)	<p>Chough (Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax) [A346]</p> <p>Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA National</p>	7 km southeast	Yes. Potential nitrogen and ammonia emissions to air.	Y

	Parks & Wildlife Service			
Seven Heads SPA (004191)	Chough (Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax) [A346] Seven Heads SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service	14.1km southeast	No hydrological or physical ecological connection to SPA	N

¹ Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³if no connections: N

Given the proximity of the site to a number of SAC and SPA sites, potential effects could occur due to surface water run off during construction and operation and airborne ammonia and nitrogen during operation, will require management to avoid impacts.

Significant effects from other pathways have been ruled out i.e., habitat loss, spread of invasive species, impacts from noise and disturbance.

The spreading of organic fertilisers is managed under the GAP Regulations 2022. These regulations are for the purpose of preventing water pollution. They provide for the limitation of quantities of nitrates and phosphate that can be directly applied to land. Surface water is protected through the provision of buffers from surface water features. Groundwater is protected by the prohibition of direct discharge to groundwater and measures to prevent indirect pollution through discharge to ground and percolation through the soil. Therefore, I am satisfied, subject to the adherence to the GAP Regulations 2022, that no in-combination or cumulative impacts arise from any land spreading associated with the proposed development.

Reliance on the GAP Regulations for the control of land spreading is not a mitigation measure for the purpose of preventing a significant effect on any European Site as this is governed by regulation and applies to all land where spreading takes place, to prevent pollution to surface water and groundwater.

Potential impacts to Seven Heads SPA are ruled out due to separation distances and absence of connections to the SPA.

Step 3. Describe the likely effects of the project (if any, alone or in combination) on European Sites

Due to the application of the precautionary principle, impacts generated by the construction and operation of the proposed development require consideration to the SAC, due to proximity and potential airborne impacts.

Sources of impact and likely significant effects are detailed in the table below.

AA Screening matrix

Site name Qualifying interests	Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	Impacts	Effects
<p>Site 1: Kilkeran Lake and Castlefreke Dunes SAC (001061)</p> <p>QI list: As above</p>	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect: Localised, temporary, low magnitude impacts from dust and construction related emissions.</p> <p>Localized, low magnitude impacts on water quality (pollution and sedimentation) from surface water disposal from development and from on site effluent disposal.</p> <p>Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Having regard to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the domestic nature and small scale of development proposed, - lack of direct connections or pathways, - the distance to receiving features, - normal best construction practices, - disposal of uncontaminated storm water to ground, - disposal of effluent on site to normal EPA CoP standards, <p>it is highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality or QI species of the SAC.</p> <p>Low risk to SAC related to any minor construction related emissions.</p> <p>Low risk of surface or ground water borne pollutants or sediments reaching the SAC. Land spreading impacts part of separate regulation process.</p> <p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.	

<p>Clonakilty Bay SAC (Site Code 000091)</p> <p>QI List as above</p>	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect:</p> <p>Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N</p>		
<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.</p>		
<p>Myross Wood SAC (Site Code 001070)</p> <p>QI List as above</p>	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect:</p> <p>Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N</p>		
<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.</p>		
<p>Bandon River SAC (Site Code 002171)</p> <p>QI List as above</p>	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect:</p> <p>Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
<p>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N</p>		
<p>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed</p>		

	development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.	
Castletownshend SAC (Site Code 001547) QI List as above	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect: Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.	
Clonakilty Bay SPA (Site Code 004081) QI List as above	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect: Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N	
	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.	
Galley Head to Duneen Point SPA (Site Code 004190) QI List as above	<p>Direct: No direct impacts within the SAC.</p> <p>Indirect: Potential emission of excess ammonia and nitrogen to air environment.</p>	<p>Ammonia and nitrogen depositions below and within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive receptors within European sites.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>
	Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): N	

	If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Step 4 Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

The construction or operation of the proposed development will not result in impacts that could affect the conservation objectives of the SAC and SPA sites listed above. Due to distance and lack of meaningful ecological connections there will be no changes in ecological functions due to any construction related emissions or disturbance. There will be no direct or ex-situ effects from disturbance on mobile species during construction or operation of the proposed development. Ammonia and nitrogen levels will remain within EPA accepted limits at identified sensitive locations within the European Sites that are located within the zone of influence of the subject proposal. No mitigation measures beyond normal standard construction and operational mitigation and drainage works are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

Having carried out Screening for Appropriate Assessment of the project in accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), I conclude that that the project individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on European Sites within the surrounding area, or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the development and lack of impact mechanisms that could significantly affect a European Site
- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites
- No ex-situ impacts

Appendix 4 – WFD Assessment

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING			
Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality			
An Comisiún Pleanála ref. no.	PL-500735-WC-26	Townland, address	Derryduff, Rosscarbery, Co. Cork
Description of project	Demolition of existing piggery accommodating 1,250 pigs (500 weaning and 750 production pigs) and construction of replacement piggery complex for 2,000 weaning pigs and 1,600 production pigs.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	<p>Site is an existing piggery in a rural area</p> <p>No water features on the site or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>Site not located within a flood zone area.</p> <p>Site rises steeply from road to pig housing which is located at an elevated position.</p> <p>Site is c.1km to Ownahinchy River and c. 5.7km to Rosscarbery Bay and is within the WFD Catchment of Bandon-Ilen.</p>		
Proposed surface water details	Surface water to on site soakaways		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Private well confirmed to be within defined standards for drinking water		
Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues	Onsite wastewater treatment system		

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	C.1km east	OWNAHINCHY_010 Code: IE_SW_20O030400	Moderate	At Risk	Agriculture	Potential surface water and nutrient runoff
Coastal	C. 5.7km southeast	Rosscarbery Bay IE_SW_110_0000	Moderate	Review	None Identified	Potential Surface water Runoff
Groundwater	Underlying site	Skibereen-Clonakilty Code: IE_SW_G_085	Good	Not at risk	None identified	Surface water drainage to ground Effluent treatment and disposal to ground

Step 3: 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.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE

No.	Component	Waterbody 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.
	Surface	OWNAHINCHY_010 Code: IE_SW_200030400	Surface run off	pollution and sedimentation	standard best practice construction. Land spreading responsibility of individual receiving farmers and managed by European communities Good	No	Screened out

					Agricultural Practice Regulations		
	Coastal	Rosscarbery Bay IE_SW_110_0000	Surface water	Pollution and sedimentation	Standard best practice construction. Separation distance	No	Screened Out
	Ground	Skibereen-Clonakilty Code: IE_SW_G_085	underground	Pollution, ground filtration	standard best practice construction and environmental protection measures	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface	OWNAHINCHY_010 Code: IE_SW_200030400	Surface run off	pollution and sedimentation	Onsite drainage and soakaways	No	Screened out
	Coastal	Rosscarbery Bay IE_SW_110_0000	Surface run off	Pollution and sedimentation	On site drainage and soakaways	No	Screened Out

4.	Ground	Skibereen-Clonakilty Code: IE_SW_G_085	underground	pollution and ground filtration	On site drainage to BRE standards, WWTS to EPA CoP standards	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	NA						