



|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Development</b>                  | Retention of expanded residential curtilage granted under planning reference 09/2052 and 02/5649, retention of vehicular entrance, retention of removal of existing trees, and retention of installation of crushed stone. |
| <b>Location</b>                     | 9, Coastguard Cottages, Rock Island, Goleen, Co. Cork, P81 DF77  |
| <b>Planning Authority</b>           | Cork County Council  |
| <b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b> | 25270  |
| <b>Applicant(s)</b>                 | Tom Owens and Louise Creagh  |
| <b>Type of Application</b>          | Retention  |
| <b>Planning Authority Decision</b>  | Grant Retention with Conditions  |
| <b>Type of Appeal</b>               | Third Party Normal Planning Appeal   |
| <b>Appellant(s)</b>                 | Paul D Leech   |
| <b>Observer(s)</b>                  | None   |
| <b>Date of Site Inspection</b>      | 18 May 2026  |
| <b>Inspector</b>                    | Natalie de Róiste  |

## 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.....               | 6  |
| 5.0  | Policy Context.....                 | 7  |
| 6.0  | EIA Screening.....                  | 10 |
| 7.0  | The Appeal .....                    | 10 |
| 8.0  | Assessment .....                    | 13 |
| 9.0  | AA Screening.....                   | 20 |
| 10.0 | Water Framework Directive.....      | 20 |
| 11.0 | Recommendation.....                 | 21 |
| 12.0 | Reasons and Considerations .....    | 21 |
| 13.0 | Conditions.....                     | 21 |

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The site, no 9 Coastguard cottages, Rock Island, contains a two-storey detached house of c. 145 sqm with a side and rear garden. The house is located close to the local road to the south, and the west gable is directly adjacent to the road that leads north to the original terrace of coastguard cottages. The original plot measures c. 500 sqm; the proposed expanded curtilage (by incorporating lands to the east) measures 1540 sqm. The extended area is partly under tree cover, partly under undergrowth, and partly covered in crushed stone. Part of the stone boundary wall has been demolished to provide vehicular access to this area.
- 1.2. Rock Island is located south of the Mizen Peninsula, north of Crookhaven, and contains the old Coastguard station at the west end, and the Crookhaven Lighthouse station at the east end. It is c. 3 km by road to Goleen to the north. It is 700 metres across water to Crookhaven to the southwest; or 7 km by road.

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. It is proposed to retain:
- Creation of vehicular entrance by removal of part of stone boundary wall
  - Increase in residential curtilage (amending permission 02/5649 and 09/2052)
  - Retention of removal of existing trees and vegetation to expanded curtilage
  - Retention of installation of crushed stone to part of expanded curtilage, to facilitate parking.
- 2.2. Permission is sought for:
- Upgrading existing domestic wastewater treatment system
  - Construction of stone piers and erection of gates to vehicular entrance
  - Construction of a shed (37 sqm)
  - All ancillary site works and landscaping
- 2.3. Following a request for further information, revised drawings were submitted with additional planting and landscaping.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Decision**

#### **3.2. Granted.**

##### **3.2.1. Conditions**

Fifteen conditions were attached, including conditions on landscaping and planting, including security bond; materials and use of the shed; screening of the LPG tank; maintenance of the new septic tank, and decommissioning of the existing one; and sightlines from the vehicular entrance.

#### **3.3. Planning Authority Reports**

##### **3.3.1. Planning Reports**

- Primary Report – site context and planning history noted, policy context and ecological context considered. AA and EIA screened out. Third party submission and departmental reports considered. Refusal on tree loss not justified, but further information required on localised ecological impacts, and on sightlines. Upgrading of antiquated wastewater treatment system to be welcomed in principle.
- Further Information Report – development should be readvertised as significant further information.
- Following readvertisement – response, departmental reports, third party submission noted. Road safety, waste water, ecological impacts, and screening of LPG tank considered acceptable subject to conditions. Grant recommended.

##### **3.3.2. Other Technical Reports**

- Ecology – primary report – Further Information required on site of ecological value; Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) report and biodiversity-led landscaping plan required.
- Ecology – further information report – EclA report submitted states that the habitat (resulting from woodland planting associated with the estate of Rock Island House) was of moderate ecological value, and not a habitat of high ecological value. No birds or mammals recorded during walkover surveys. Biodiversity-led landscape plan

largely satisfactory, subject to appropriate measures to avoid commercial seed mixes. Largely satisfied with response provided, conditions to be attached.

- Area Engineer – primary report – defer decision, for revised drawings showing sightlines from entrance, number of bedrooms to property, and separation distance from wastewater treatment system to the sea line high water mark.

- Area Engineer – further information report – submitted drawings showing 3-bedroom house acceptable for 6pp wwts. Sightlines of 80 metres to east and 40 metres to west appropriate given the lightly trafficked road. Distance from high water mark is 45 metres, marginally less than desired 50 metres, but acceptable given it is an improvement on existing septic tank. No objection subject to conditions.

#### 3.4. **Prescribed Bodies**

3.5. No reports on file.

#### 3.6. **Third Party Observations**

Two received, from the appellant (one following submission of further information). Issues raised are summarised as follows.

##### First submission

- No consultation with neighbours
- Principle of development – relocation of wastewater treatment plant – is reasonable, due to proximity to the house
- Extensive and substantial unauthorised development on the site, which is high in biodiversity, and fronts an SAC and pNHA.
- The ‘blue line area’ is a common area for the nine dwellings, 1-9 Coastguard Cottages, permitted under 90/3789. The project received a Cork County Council Environmental Award. This former coastguard complex is a compact *urbs in rure*, with the Watch House and Boat House refurbished, with the derelict terrace of older Coastguard houses converted to walled gardens, and the later Coastguard station subsequently restored. Historical contextual images are provided.
- The unauthorised developments should be reversed insofar as is practical. The gas tank should be removed, relocated, or screened. The removal of the stone boundary wall is unacceptable. The shed is an inappropriate suburban-style development. Any

development should be urbane in character, preserving the integrity of Rock Street, like the Watch House and Boat House developments.

- A bollard has been erected further along the County road, creating an obstruction.

#### Second submission

- Given the lack of meaningful revisions, the application should be refused.
- The submitted Ecological Impact Assessment Report is questionable, finding no evidence of any birds or mammals on the site during two walkover site visits.
- No credible comment is offered on conditions prior to the unauthorised developments, and no consideration is given to restoration.
- Adjacent environments (European Dry Heath within the blue line area, the water gardens at Rock Island, Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA 300 metres away) have not been appropriately considered. The Chough population in that SPA has declined 66% in 20 years, and they forage nearby.
- Traffic hazard has not been addressed, particularly for trailers emerging from the site.
- The common green area for the nine dwellings is now claimed by the applicant.

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1. The following site history was referred to in the planner's report:

- 24/691 – application for upgrading of wastewater treatment system, construction of shed, vehicular entrance gates, and ancillary site works invalidated for failure to advertise expansion of curtilage, tree clearance and importation of crushed rock to use land for car parking.
- 09/2025 – permission granted for lean-to conservatory to rear
- Reg ref 02/5649 – permission granted for porch and first-floor extension

The following was referred to in the third party submission:

- P90 3789 – parent permission for 9 dwelling units and launderette (including the conservation of terrace of Coastguard Cottages)

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Cork County Development Plan 2022-28

5.1.1. The lands are not zoned.

5.1.2. *Chapter 5 Rural* addresses rural areas of the county. *Objective RP 5-23: Servicing Single Houses (and ancillary development) in Rural Areas* has an objective;

- a) Ensure that proposals for development incorporating on-site wastewater disposal systems comply with the EPA Code of Practice Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent  $\leq 10$ ).
- b) Surface water should be disposed of using sustainable drainage systems and in a manner that will not endanger the receiving environment or public health. The use of permeable paving should also be considered to reduce run off.

5.1.3. *Chapter 12 Transport and Mobility* addresses car parking, and includes the following as part of *Objective TM 12-9: Parking*

*f) A high standard of design, layout and landscaping, including application of sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate, is to accompany any proposal for surface car parking. Planning permission will be granted only where all the following criteria are met:*

- *Respects the character of the streetscape/landscape;*
- *Will not adversely affect visual amenity, and*
- *Makes provision for security, and the direct and safe access and movement of pedestrians and cyclists within the site.*

5.1.4. *Chapter 14 Green Infrastructure and Recreation* aims to protect and enhance biodiversity, provide for recreational and amenity facilities and maintain and enhance landscape character. In relation to landscape, the site is located within a high value landscape as outlined in *figure 14-2 High Value Landscapes* of the plan.

*Objective GI 14-9: Landscape*

*a) Protect the visual and scenic amenities of County Cork's built and natural environment.*

- b) Landscape issues will be an important factor in all land-use proposals, ensuring that a pro-active view of development is undertaken while protecting the environment and heritage generally in line with the principle of sustainability.*
- c) Ensure that new development meets high standards of siting and design.*
- d) Protect skylines and ridgelines from development.*
- e) Discourage proposals necessitating the removal of extensive amounts of trees, hedgerows and historic walls or other distinctive boundary treatments.*

*Objective GI 14-10: Draft Landscape Strategy*

*Ensure that the management of development throughout the County will have regard for the value of the landscape, its character, distinctiveness and sensitivity as recognised in the Cork County Draft Landscape Strategy and its recommendations, in order to minimize the visual and environmental impact of development, particularly in areas designated as High Value Landscapes where higher development standards (layout, design, landscaping, materials used) will be required.*

5.1.5. *Chapter 15 Biodiversity and Environment* aims to protect the natural environment, biodiversity and ecosystems, and contribute to efforts to reverse the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystems and the environment.

5.1.6. *Objective BE 15-6 Biodiversity and New Development* is to provide for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in the development management process and when licensing or permitting other activities by:

- b) Encouraging the retention and integration of existing trees, hedgerows and other features of high natural value within new developments;*
- c) Requiring the incorporation of primarily native tree and other plant species, particularly pollinator friendly species in the landscaping of new developments;*

*BE 15-7: Control of Invasive Alien Species*

*Implement best practice to minimise the risk of spread of invasive alien species, on Council owned or managed land, and require the development and implementation of Invasive Alien Species Management Plans for new developments where required.*

5.1.7. *Chapter 16 Built and Cultural Heritage* recognises the importance of identifying, valuing and safeguarding heritage through appropriate protection, management and enhancement, or via sensitive development.

5.1.8. The property is not a protected structure, nor is it within an ACA.

*HE 16-20 Historic Landscapes*

*a) Recognise the contribution and importance of historic landscapes and their contribution to the appearance of the countryside, their significance as archaeological, architectural, historical and ecological resources.*

*b) Protect the archaeological, architectural, historic and cultural element of the historic/heritage landscapes of the County of Cork.*

*c) All new development within historic landscapes should be assessed in accordance with and giving due regard to Cork County Councils 'Guidance Notes for the Appraisal of Historic Gardens, Demesnes, Estates and their Settings' or any other relevant guidance notes or documents issued during the lifetime of the Plan.*

**5.2. Relevant National or Regional Policy / Ministerial Guidelines**

**5.3. EPA Code of Practice Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent ≤ 10) 2021.**

5.4. The Code of Practice (CoP) provides guidance on domestic waste water treatment systems (DWWTSs) for single houses or equivalent developments with a population equivalent (PE) of less than or equal to 10 and sets out a methodology for site assessment and selection, installation and maintenance of an appropriate DWWTS. The CoP in the various chapters sets out in detail requirements and guidance on site characterisation, site suitability assessment, determining site suitability and the appropriate design solution in relation to an appropriate DWWDT. It also refers to designing an on-site DWWTS to treat and dispose of the waste water, addressing whether the soil and/or subsoil can accommodate the waste water volumes; can the soil and/or subsoil treat the waste water sufficiently and can all minimum separation distances be met.

## 5.5. Natural Heritage Designations

Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC 001040 – c. 5 metres to the south (across the road), and c. 50 metres to the north.

Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA 004156 – c. 330 metres to the south.

Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point pNHA 001040 – c. 5 metres to the south (across the road), and c. 50 metres to the north.

## 6.0 EIA Screening

6.1. The proposed development is not a class for the purposes of EIA as per the classes of development set out in Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001, as amended (or Part V of the 1994 Roads).

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

One appeal was received, from a third party against the grant of permission. This appellant has a Dublin address, and notes in his original submission that he spends c 40% of his time at his home/studio at 3 Crookhaven Coastguard Cottages. Issues raised are as follows:

- Original observations on the planning file should be noted by the Commission.
- In the context that 85% of our ecologically protected sites are under threat, with up to 51% showing ongoing decline, a grant of permission for unauthorised development such as this would set an undesirable precedent.
- The site fronts onto a designated landscape (both SAC and pNHA) and is adjacent to an SPA. Rock Island Watchtower (NIAH no 20914719) is proximate, and *Tuberaria Guttata* was recently identified at its base. This environment is sensitive to straggling ribbon development, fragmented and suburban.
- *Mibora Minima* has also been identified locally, and the Chough (amber listed, and subject to population collapse in the nearby SPA) has local habitat on Rock Island, on and around the subject site.

- The proposal contravenes Planning Permission reg ref 90/3789, which provided for common amenity areas for the nine dwellings, which are now shown in the blue line ownership of the applicant. With a population of c. 50 people, the common area is much needed.
- Reports commissioned and paid for by applicants tend to lack objectivity; the submitted report included only cursory examination and out-of-season walkthroughs be noted no fauna on site, and made a cursory examination, with two out-of-season walk through inspections. The unauthorised metttled area is misclassified as ED3 in the report.
- Significant hazards include the risk from the unbunded LPG tank; the risk of overflow/malfunction from the wastewater treatment system; the risk of eventual macadam surfaces to the paved area; and the risk from likely storage of outboard engine fuel and other matter.
- The Ecological reports from Cork County Council expressed substantial concerns, which have not been addressed.
- The Planner’s report also set out many concerns.
- Gardening is not a fix for ecological destruction.
- Permission should be refused and a more sensitive development proposed.

## 7.2. **Applicant Response in the case of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Appeal**

7.3. A response was received from the applicant’s agent and is summarised as follows:

- The house has been a second home for the applicants for over 20 years and is shortly to become a more permanent home for them. They are seeking to improve the house and lands both for themselves and for the benefit of the environment.
- Although regularly serviced, the existing wastewater treatment system was inspected in 2023, and reportedly was not originally installed correctly, and is causing undesirable groundwater pollution.
- The roadside entrance and hardcore area, and the associated tree removal, were carried out to facilitate access for the LPG tank installation, and the applicants did not realise planning permission was required for such works.

- The commission is referred to the report prepared by Limosa Environmental, and the response letter provided by them, which addresses the appellants concerns regarding environmental matters.
- The issue of land ownership is a completely separate issue, which refers to nearby lands which are not part of the proposed expanded residential curtilage (which land is in the sole ownership of the applicants). Copies of folios are provided in the interests of clarity.
- The total population of the holiday cottages is c. 20-25 in summer, not 50.
- The EclA is a professionally prepared objective assessment, and the references to it in the appeal are offensive.
- The appellant has outlined unlikely risk scenarios which are pure conjecture. The tank is a typical domestic LPG tank. The wastewater treatment system will have alarms, warning systems, and is suitable for the site. There is no proposal for non-permeable surfaces. The applicant does own a small boat, but does not store engine fuel at the property.
- All concerns of the council Planner and Ecologist have been addressed by the submission of further information and the conditions attached to the grant.
- The applicant's intention is to re-wild the area not covered by hardcore, not to engage in gardening. This will consist of native shrubs, trees, and pollinator friendly flowers and plants.
- The application is to regularise development carried out, and to add positively to the site and local environment. The Commission is requested to consider the material on the file and to grant planning permission.

7.4. A response letter was also included from the Ecological and Environmental Consultancy who carried out the EclA. The main points are summarised as follows:

- The ecology report was written to address the issues raised in the request for further information. All issues were dealt with to conclusion.
- The proximity to designated sites was addressed in Section 5.1 of the ecology report, and the potential for pathways was considered in Section 6.1. There is no risk of impact to any designated site (SAC, SPA, or pNHA). Neither *Tuberaria guttata* or

*Mibora minima* would be expected to occur within the subject site. Nor would they be impacted by the works, if they do occur in the vicinity. These plants have specific habitat requirements that do not and did not occur within the site, due to the history and origins of the woodland now present.

- The works propose no threat to the Chough, and its inclusion in the appeal is irrelevant.
- The level of work completed in the EclA relates to the nature and scale of the retained and proposed works. The habitats within the site are not of high ecological importance, the dominant habitat is non-native woodland with a poor quality non-native understorey full of invasive species. This is set out on p. 35. Two site visits were deemed suitable for such a small-scale project by the author of the report who has 25 years of experience (cv appended).
- The conclusion is reiterated.

#### **7.5. Planning Authority Response**

None received.

#### **7.6. Observations**

None received.

#### **7.7. Further Responses**

None received.

### **8.0 Assessment**

8.1. I have examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including the submission received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, the material submitted with the application, and the planning history. I have inspected the site, and I have had regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance. I consider the substantive issues to be considered as follows:

- Principle of development
- Waste water treatment
- Ecological impacts

- Design and visual amenity

## 8.2. **Principle of development**

- 8.3. The appellant emphasises the unauthorised nature of the development on the site, and in submissions to the council noted that reversal of the works could be requested or directed by the council.
- 8.4. Section 32 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that permission is required for the retention of unauthorised development, and Section 34 of the same act states that an authority may decide to grant or refuse such a permission. There are numerous references to retention of unauthorised development in the planning legislation. An application for retention is an appropriate mechanism to attempt to address unauthorised development. The development can be assessed on its merits, having regard to national and council policy, and protection of amenities.
- 8.5. The appellant states that the proposal to extend the domestic curtilage is invalid, as it does not comply with the parent permission 90/3789. Again, an application for permission or retention is an appropriate mechanism to amend a previous permission, or a condition thereof.

## 8.6. **Wastewater treatment**

- 8.7. The appellant has concerns regarding the possible malfunction or overflow of the new wastewater treatment system.
- 8.8. I note at the outset that the proposed tertiary treatment system is a replacement for an existing wastewater treatment system stated to be a dated BioCycle wastewater treatment system installed prior to 2002, with an undefined percolation area. There is no extension or alteration proposed to the existing house, although the applicants note (in their response to the appeal) that they are planning shortly to make it a more permanent residence, rather than a second home. As such, there is likely to be an increase in wastewater emissions from the house, due to a longer duration of occupation.

- 8.9. The existing site is relatively small for a rural house – while the garden is adequate for residential amenity, it does not provide the separation distance required from the house to the wastewater treatment system as per the Code of Practice (10 metres minimum between the house and the infiltration/treatment area). The wastewater system is indicated on the existing site plan in the side garden, which is c. 9 metres in width. The site rises steeply to the rear, and is thickly vegetated.
- 8.10. A site suitability assessment was submitted, prepared in line with the EPA Code of Practice. This noted the presence of bedrock outcrops in the area, and the Locally Important Aquifer, giving a Groundwater Protection Response of R2<sup>1</sup>. The visual inspection noted no outcrops of bedrock on the site, and no lakes, beaches, shellfish areas, wetlands, watercourses or streams or drainage ditches within acceptable separation distances. No springs or wells were noted, with a mains water supply in place. Bedrock was encountered at 0.9 metres depth, with the soil and subsoil being sandy clay, unmottled and free draining. The assessor identified a tertiary treatment system and infiltration/treatment area as the only suitable option, recommending a proprietary packaged wastewater treatment system with a tertiary polishing filter, with regular desludging.
- 8.11. The Local Authority Area Engineer noted that the proposed wastewater treatment system was suitably sized, and was a significant upgrade on the existing system. I concur with this assessment. They noted a marginal shortfall in the distance to the high water mark – c. 45 metres, compared with a minimum required of 50 metres. However, this appears to be a greater distance than the existing wastewater treatment system. I also note the appellant's concern regarding impacts on the well indicated on the historic maps in the grounds of Rock Island House (although there is no indication this is in use). Again, the installation of a wastewater treatment system with a tertiary polishing filter, and the decommissioning of the existing system, will decrease rather than increase risks to that historic well, and to groundwater as a whole.
- 8.12. On the whole, the installation of a new tertiary system is to be welcomed, and will decrease the risks of malfunction, or overflow of pathogen laden water.

### 8.13. **Ecological impacts**

- 8.14. The appellant has concerns regarding impacts on ecology and biodiversity, the loss of habitat, the content and conclusions of the EclA, and pollution risks.
- 8.15. An Ecological Impact Assessment was submitted in response to concerns from the County Ecology Department regarding the removal of broadleaf woodland, and the requirement to identify any and all habitats of high ecological value.
- 8.16. The EclA states that the site contains three habitats, recolonising bare ground ED3 (the area which has been covered with stone chips), Scrub WS1 (the area which has been disturbed by tree removal and trial holes for the waste water treatment system) and Mixed broadleaved Woodland WD1 (the area to the north of the site). (I note that the red line boundary on p. 28 of the report is approximate, and the actual boundary includes Mixed broadleaved Woodland both to the north and to the east (as shown by the tree cover on the existing and proposed site plans)). The EclA goes on to note that the woodland likely originated from planting within the estate of Rock Island House, and is classified as highly modified/non-native under Fossitt (2000). It is naturally regenerating, due to the nature of Sycamore, a prolific self-seeder, and the most common species of tree observed. Wych elms were also observed, with a species-poor understorey of ferns, ivy, and montbretia. The EclA notes that the remainder of the island, outside of the woodland area is either bare rock or a mosaic of Dry humid acid grassland GS3, Wet heath HH3, and Dry Siliceous Heath HH1, with links to Annex 1 habitats of greater ecological value.
- 8.17. Having visited the site, I consider the EclA to provide a good account of the species and habitats therein. I consider it reasonable to classify the cleared area as recolonising bare ground ED3, having observed considerable ground cover at the margins, near the site entrance and to the north and east of the cleared area, with tufts of grass and weeds throughout the central area. I did not observe any fauna species on the site. I note however that weather was inclement, and there was disturbance from a nearby construction site and construction traffic.
- 8.18. The appellant notes that choughs forage nearby, and that their numbers have declined by 66% in the adjacent SPA in the last 20 years, while they have increased in other SPAs.

- 8.19. I have consulted *Status and Distribution of Chough in Ireland: Results of the National Survey 2021 Irish Wildlife Manuals 151*. This survey notes that chough are associated with pastoral-dominated farming systems with short grazed vegetation in either coastal or mountainous landscapes. In Ireland, the current distribution is restricted to the western seaboard. For foraging, chough prefer extensively managed unimproved grassland habitats, as they require a short sward (< 5cm) and bare ground, to provide easy access to invertebrates in the soil (which are positively associated with dung). Studies have shown that chough tend to spend the majority of their time close to their nest sites, and prefer to commute along the coast from coastal breeding sites, rather than inland.
- 8.20. This survey notes that there was a 65.7% reduction in breeding pairs between 2002/03 and 2021 in the Sheep's Head – Toe Head SPA. An additional 29 pairs were recorded inland of this SPA in 2021. Inland nest sites (more than 1 km from the mean high-water mark) include quarries, ruins, mineshafts, sheds and other farm buildings, and other built structures, including nest boxes.
- 8.21. As such, notwithstanding the distance from the SPA, there may be a nest site in the vicinity. Furthermore, the Site Synopsis for the Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC (in close proximity to the appeal site) notes that the SAC is of notable ornithological importance for Chough, with 9 breeding pairs in 1992, and with substantial numbers of individuals using the heath and sandy habitats for feeding and socialising. However, the site itself does not contain any structures likely to provide a nest site. Nor does the habitat to be cleared (Scrub WS1 and Mixed broadleaved woodland WD1) provide foraging opportunities that might be lost.
- 8.22. The appellant notes the existence of *Tuberaria Guttata* (spotted rock rose) at the base of the tower in the nearby SAC, and *Mibora Minima* (Early Sand-grass) identified locally. The former is found in European dry heaths, while the latter is a sand dune grass found at Barley Cove Beach. I note the applicant's ecologist's response to the appeal states that these plants have specific habitat requirements that are not provided by the site, and there is no risk of impact to them, as they are not found on the site. I find this to be a reasonable conclusion.
- 8.23. Regarding pollution risks, the issue of wastewater treatment is assessed above.

- 8.24. Regarding the risks from leakage from the LPG tank, I note the installation of the LPG tank does not form part of this application. The tank is shown on the existing site plan, and it was not advertised in the public notices. An exemption exists for the provision of fuel storage tanks (Class 2(a) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Planning and Development Act 2001 (as amended)) within the curtilage of a house. Fuel storage tanks are a typical feature in domestic contexts.
- 8.25. Regarding the risk of storage from outboard engine fuel (associated with boats), I note this is an existing residence in a coastal area, and the applicant's response states that they are already boat owners. I observed a small water craft on a trailer on the site during the course of my site visit. I do not consider the proposed works, or the works to be retained, increase the risk of storage of outboard engine fuel.
- 8.26. **Design and Visual Amenity**
- 8.27. The appellant sets out the history of the conservation and refurbishment of the Coastguard cottages complex, and refers to the complex as compact *urbs in rure* (town in the countryside) and objects to the proposed development as straggling, suburban and fragmented.
- 8.28. Rock Island contains a lighthouse and a cluster of houses associated with it at the east end, while at the west end it contains the restored coastguard buildings (some greatly altered) and to the east of these, Rock Island House, a country house set in its own extensive landscaped grounds. Two square-profile lookout towers survive on the island in a ruinous condition.
- 8.29. The image submitted by the appellant in his original submission (stated to be from 1905) shows a single-storey rectangular-plan building with a hipped roof in the location of no 9 Coastguard Cottages. A 1955 aerial photograph available from the Morgan Aerial Photographic Collection in the National Library of Ireland (digitised <https://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtIs000734470>) shows ruinous remains on the site. It also shows a clear demarcation between the woodlands in the vicinity of Rock Island House, and the neighbouring plot, the subject of the appeal.
- 8.30. I note that none of the holiday homes in the coastguard complex have been surveyed by the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage (although the nearby Rock Island House and its boathouse, and the nearby signal tower, have been). None of the

coastguard complex structures have been added to the Record of Protected Structures (although Rock Island House has been). No ACA (Architectural Conservation Area) is in force.

- 8.31. As noted above, the site is located within a high value landscape. The site is not visible from the north, from the scenic route on the R591 designated in the County Development Plan. This scenic route terminates in the village of Crookhaven, across the water to the south. Neither the house, garden, nor the expanded curtilage are visible from this point in Crookhaven village, although the house is visible from further east on the Crookhaven headland.
- 8.32. The main visual impacts will be from the shed, and these will be relatively localised. This is a utilitarian structure, of no particular architectural merit or interest, although I do not consider it to be obtrusive or particularly eye-catching. Proposed materials are appropriate, consisting of a slate roof, zinc rainwater goods, painted rendered walls, a timber framed door, and a roller shutter. It is located to the rear of the site, against a backdrop of rising ground and tree cover. The site section (drawing 23043\_06) shows cliffs sloping towards the sea in front of the house. However, there is rising ground to the east. From the village of Crookhaven, the shed will be hidden by the house. From further east on the island of Crookhaven, the shed will be partly hidden by the outcrop of bedrock in front of it. I consider visual impacts acceptable.

### 8.33. **Other issues**

- 8.33.1. The appellant has raised the issue of land ownership, noting that the area included within the blue line (ie, lands in the ownership of the applicant, that are not part of the development site) was intended as communal open space for the nine holiday homes. No development is indicated on those lands. I note the Development Management Guidelines 2007 state (*Section 5.13 Issues relating to title to land*) that *'the planning system is not designed as a mechanism for resolving disputes about title to land or premises or rights over land; these are ultimately matters for resolution in the Courts'*.

## 9.0 AA Screening

9.1.1. See Appendix 2 of this report for Appropriate Assessment Screening Determination. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

9.1.2. This determination is based on:

- The relatively minor scale of the subject development;
- The weakness of connectivity between the development and European Sites,
- Disposal of effluent on site to normal EPA Code of Practice standards, and;
- Standard pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and effectiveness of same.

## 10.0 Water Framework Directive

10.1.1. The subject site is located on Rock Island, c. 30 metres from the high water mark (Roaring Water Bay EI-SW\_140\_0000) and on top of the Skibbereen-Clonakilty IE-SW-G-085 Ground Waterbody. I have assessed the development and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

10.1.2. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The modest scale and nature of the development

- the replacement of an existing non-compliant wastewater treatment system with a new system with a tertiary polishing filter, designed in compliance with *EPA Code of Practice Domestic Waste Water Treatment Systems (Population Equivalent  $\leq 10$ )*
- The lack of hydrological connection to the coastal waters.

## **Conclusion**

I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

## **11.0 Recommendation**

11.1. I recommend a grant of permission.

## **12.0 Reasons and Considerations**

Having regard to the provisions of the Cork County Development Plan 2022-2028, including the location within a high value landscape, the nature, scale, character and location of the proposed development and the development to be retained, the planning history on the site, and the habitats on the site and in the surrounding area, it is considered that the proposed development, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, would not seriously injure the visual or scenic amenities of the area, would not be prejudicial to public health, would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety, ecology, and heritage protection, and would be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## **13.0 Conditions**

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application, as amended by the further plans and particulars received by the planning authority on the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2025 and 16<sup>th</sup> January 2026, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the

following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. Prior to the commencement of any further development, security in the form of a Bond in the amount of €1,500.00 shall be provided to the Planning Authority to guarantee the satisfactory completion of tree and shrub planting and all other landscaping proposals for the site as required by Condition 3 and Condition 4 below. The sum lodged pursuant to this condition shall be refunded only when it is certified by the Planning Authority that the planting and landscaping have been completed to its satisfaction.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory completion of the development.

3. Landscaping of this site shall be carried out in accordance with the landscaping plan received by the Planning Authority on 16th December 2025 and as updated by the conditions of planning herein. All landscape planting shall be completed within 2 years of the final grant of permission for this development. Any trees that die or are removed within the lifetime of the development shall be replaced in the first planting season thereafter.

Reason: To protect biodiversity.

4. The use of wildflower seed mixes will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. Wildflower meadows should be allowed to generate naturally, with wildflowers occurring within the seed bank encouraged to flourish through a management regime. Wildflower meadows will be managed in accordance with the All-Ireland Pollinator Plan. Full details of the management regime shall be provided to the Planning Authority for agreement prior to the commencement of any further development.  
Should the use of seed mixes be required, only wildflower seed mixes of Irish provenance will be allowed. The applicant shall submit reasoned justification for the requirement for native wildflower seed mixes prior to any seeding.

Evidence of the acquisition of guaranteed native Irish wildflower seed mixes shall be submitted to the planning authority prior to any use.

Reason: In the interests of ecological protection, and to avoid introducing invasive species.

5. All works shall be implemented in accordance with mitigation measures specified in the Ecological Impact Assessment report received by the Planning Authority 16th December 2025, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of protection of protected species and/or habitats of high natural value.

6. Any cutting of trees, hedgerows and vegetation shall only be undertaken outside of the bird breeding season. The bird breeding season takes place between March 1st and August 31st.

Reason: To minimise risks to breeding birds.

7. Construction activities shall be carried out in accordance with good practise as set out in CIRIA Guidelines Control of Water Pollution from Construction Sites – Guide to Good Practise.

Reason: To ensure no surface water impacts on the receiving environment.

8. Sight distance of 40.00 metres to the west and 80.00 metres to the east SHALL BE provided and maintained from centre point of entrance 2.40 metres back from the L-8405 public road edge in accordance with Drawing Number 23043\_05A Rev A received by the Planning Authority on the 16th December 2025. No vegetation or structure shall in perpetuity exceed 1.0 metre in height within the sight distance triangle.

Reason: To provide proper sight distance for emerging traffic in the interests of road safety.

9. The applicant shall enter a contract service agreement for ongoing de-sludging and maintenance of wastewater treatment system with a suitably qualified contractor.

Reason: In the interests of public health.

10. The existing septic tank shall be decommissioned and removed, or cleaned out and backfilled with selected granular fill to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of public health.

11. Site development and building works shall be carried out between the hours of 8.00 and 18.00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 08.00 and 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation from these times shall only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written agreement has been received from the planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of property in the vicinity.

12. No mud or debris from the site shall be carried onto or deposited on the public road by the developer during the construction phase.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area and in the interests of road safety.

13. The shed shall ONLY be used for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, including domestic storage but shall NOT be used for human habitation or sleeping quarters and/or any commercial or business purpose.

Reason: In accordance with the development for which permission has been sought.

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.”

---

Natalie de Róiste

Planning Inspector

16 June 2026

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Case Reference</b>   | PL-500952-CK-26   |
| <b>Proposed Development Summary</b>   | Expansion of curtilage, car parking, upgrade of wastewater treatment system, landscaping. |
| <b>Development Address</b>  | 9 Coastguard Cottages, Rock Island, Goleen, Co. Cork                                      |
| <b>IN ALL CASES CHECK BOX / OR LEAVE BLANK</b>  |   |
| <b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'Project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  | <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:<br>- The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,<br>- Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)         |   |
| <b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.<br><br><b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>   | <b>State the Class here</b>   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3  |   |
| <b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in 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?</b> |   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.<br><b>No Screening required.</b>     |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.<br><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b>  | <b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.<br><br><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b><br><b>OR</b><br><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b> | <b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b>                   |
| <b>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b>  |   |
| <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/>  | <b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b>                 |
| <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | <b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b> |

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix 2: Standard AA Screening Determination Template 2

### Test for likely significant effects

| <b>Screening for Appropriate Assessment</b><br><b>Test for likely significant effects</b> |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Case Reference Number: PL-500952-CK-26</b>   |  |
| <b>Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics</b>                  |  |
| <b>Brief description of project</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of vehicular entrance by removal of part of stone boundary wall</li> <li>• Increase in residential curtilage (amending permission 02/5649 and 09/2052)</li> <li>• Retention in removal of existing trees and vegetation to expanded curtilage</li> <li>• Retention of installation of crushed stone to part of expanded curtilage, to facilitate parking.</li> <li>• Upgrading existing domestic wastewater treatment system</li> <li>• Construction of stone piers and erection of gates to vehicular entrance</li> <li>• Construction of a shed (37 sqm)</li> <li>• All ancillary site works and landscaping</li> </ul> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">All the above at an existing house. There is no new housing or extension to the house.</p> |
| <b>Brief description of development site characteristics and</b>                          | <p>The subject site is located on Rock Island. It contains a house (145 sqm) and garden, as well as some lands to the north and east that are partly under scrub/tree cover. The original plot (house and garden) measures c. 500 sqm, while the site</p>  |

|   |  |                                      |  |   |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <p><b>potential impact mechanisms</b></p>   | <p>including the proposed expanded curtilage measures c. 1540 sqm, an increase of c. 1040 sqm. The house is part of an old Coastguard Station, repurposed as a cluster of holiday homes.</p> <p>It is proposed to decommission the existing waste water treatment system and replace it with a tertiary treatment system. It is also proposed to retain a vehicular entrance and area of hard standing, remove additional trees (to facilitate the parking area and the wastewater treatment system), and construct a shed.</p> <p>Rock Island is a peninsula at the mouth of the Crookhaven inlet, south of the Mizen Peninsula. The site is at the west end of Rock Island, c. 30 metres from the foreshore to the south, c. 60 metres to the north, and c. 250 metres to the west. There is bedrock at the surface in places immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC surrounds the Coastguard Station on all four sides and covers a large stretch of the south of the Mizen peninsula.</p> <p>The Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA lies 340 metres to the south, across Roaring Water Bay.</p> |                                      |  |   |
| <p><b>Screening report</b></p>  | <p>Yes</p>   |                                      |  |   |
| <p><b>Natura Impact Statement</b></p>   | <p>No</p>  |                                      |  |   |
| <p><b>Relevant submissions</b></p>  | <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> party submissions and appeal</b></p>  |                                      |  |   |
| <p><b>Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model</b></p> |  |                                      |  |   |
| <p><b>European Site (code)</b></p>  | <p><b>Qualifying interests<sup>1</sup><br/>Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)</b></p>  | <p><b>Distance from proposed</b></p> | <p><b>Ecological connections<sup>2</sup></b></p> | <p><b>Consider further in screening<sup>3</sup><br/>Y/N</b></p> |

|  |  | <b>development<br/>(metres)</b> |  |          |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|----------|
| Sheep's<br>Head to<br>Toe Head<br>SPA (site<br>code<br>004156)         | Peregrine (Falco<br>peregrinus) [A103]<br><br>Chough (Pyrrhocorax<br>pyrrhocorax) [A346]<br><br><a href="#">Conservation objectives</a><br><br>to maintain or restore<br>the favourable<br>conservation conditions   | <b>330 metres<br/>to south</b>  | <b>No direct,<br/>possible<br/>indirect by use<br/>of habitats by<br/>mobile species</b> | <b>Y</b> |
| Barley<br>Cove to<br>Ballyrisode<br>Point SAC<br>(site code<br>001040) | Mudflats and sandflats<br>not covered by seawater<br>at low tide [1140]<br><br>Perennial vegetation of<br>stony banks [1220]<br><br>Salicornia and other<br>annuals colonising mud<br>and sand [1310]<br><br>Atlantic salt meadows<br>(Glauco-Puccinellietalia<br>maritimae) [1330]<br><br>Mediterranean salt<br>meadows (Juncetalia<br>maritimi) [1410]<br><br>Shifting dunes along the<br>shoreline with<br>Ammophila arenaria<br>(white dunes) [2120]<br><br>Fixed coastal dunes<br>with herbaceous | <b>5 metres to<br/>south</b>    | <b>No direct,<br/>possible<br/>indirect by<br/>surface water<br/>runoff/air</b>          | <b>Y</b> |

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| vegetation (grey dunes)<br>[2130]<br><br>European dry heaths<br>[4030]<br><br>Petalophyllum ralfsii<br>(Petalwort) [1395]<br><br><a href="#">Conservation objectives</a><br><br>to maintain or restore<br>the favourable<br>conservation conditions |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

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

The proposed development will not result in any direct impacts on the Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA, or on the Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC. However, taking into account the precautionary principle, potential indirect impacts are considered below.

| Site name<br>Qualifying<br>interests   | Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*  |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | Impacts   | Effects   |
| Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA (site code 004156)<br><br>Peregrine (Falco peregrinus) [A103] | Direct: none<br><br>Indirect: localised, temporary low magnitude impacts from noise, dust, construction, and human activity during construction.<br><br>Localised low magnitude impacts on water quality (pollution and sedimentation) from surface | Having regard to the existing domestic use of the site, the nature of the existing habitats on the site, the relatively small scale of the development and relatively short duration of the works, it is highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Chough<br/>(Pyrrhocorax<br/>pyrrhocorax)<br/>[A346]</p>   | <p>water disposal from development and from on-site effluent disposal.<br/>Removal of vegetation on site.</p>   | <p>affect habitat quality or QI species of the SAC.<br/>No significant disturbance to birds that may use adjoining habitats.<br/>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p>   |
|  | <p><b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No</b></p>   |   |
|  | <p><b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b> The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.</p>   |   |
|  | <p><b>Impacts</b></p>   | <p><b>Effects</b></p>   |
| <p>Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC (site code 001040)<br/><br/>Mudflats and sandflats not covered by seawater at low tide [1140]<br/><br/>Perennial vegetation of stony banks [1220]<br/><br/>Salicornia and other annuals colonising mud</p> | <p>Direct: none<br/><br/>Indirect: localised, temporary low magnitude impacts from noise, dust, construction, and human activity during construction.<br/><br/>Localised low magnitude impacts on water quality (pollution and sedimentation) from surface water disposal from development and from on-site effluent disposal.<br/>Removal of vegetation on site.</p> | <p>Having regard to the existing domestic use of the site, the nature of the existing habitats on the site, the location of the qualifying interests, the relatively small scale of the development and relatively short duration of the works, and the disposal of effluent on site to normal EPA CoP standards, 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.<br/><br/>Low risk to SAC related to any minor construction-related emissions.</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>and sand<br/>[1310]<br/>Atlantic salt<br/>meadows<br/>(Glauco-<br/>Puccinellietalia<br/>maritimae)<br/>[1330]</p> <p>Mediterranean<br/>salt meadows<br/>(Juncetalia<br/>maritimi) [1410]</p> <p>Shifting dunes<br/>along the<br/>shoreline with<br/>Ammophila<br/>arenaria (white<br/>dunes) [2120]</p> <p>Fixed coastal<br/>dunes with<br/>herbaceous<br/>vegetation<br/>(grey dunes)<br/>[2130]</p> <p>European dry<br/>heaths [4030]</p> <p>Petalophyllum<br/>ralfsii<br/>(Petalwort)<br/>[1395]</p> |  | <p>Low risk of surface or ground water borne pollutants or sediments reaching the SAC.</p> <p>Conservation objectives would not be undermined.</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): NO</b></p>   |
|  | <p><b>If No, is there likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects?</b> The proposed development will not result in any effects that could contribute to an additive effect with other developments in the area.</p> |
| <p><b>Step 4: Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site</b></p>   |   |
| <p>I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on the Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA or the Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project.</p> <p>No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Screening Determination</b></p> <p><b>Finding of no likely significant effects</b></p> <p>In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on Barley Cove to Ballyrisode Point SAC, Sheep's Head to Toe Head SPA, or any other European Site, in view of the conservation objectives of these sites, and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.</p> <p>This determination is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relatively minor scale of the subject development;</li> <li>• The weakness of connectivity between the development and European Sites,</li> <li>• Disposal of effluent on site to normal EPA Code of Practice standards, and;</li> </ul> |   |

- Standard pollution controls that would be employed regardless of proximity to a European site and effectiveness of same.

## WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

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

|  |  |                          |  |
|--|--|--------------------------|--|
| <b>An Bord Pleanála ref. no.</b>   | PL-500952-26   | <b>Townland, address</b> | 9 Coastguard Cottages, Rock Island, Goleen, Co. Cork |
| <b>Description of project</b>  | Expansion of residential curtilage, new vehicular entrance, removal of trees, installation of crushed stone, replacement of waste water treatment system, new shed.  |                          |  |
| <b>Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,</b>                          | The site is a rural one, albeit with a mains water connection. It is located proximate to the coast, on a headland, on top of a locally important aquifer with an extreme vulnerability. It is not in an area of known flood risk. |                          |  |
| <b>Proposed surface water details</b>  | n/a  |                          |  |
| <b>Proposed water supply source &amp; available capacity</b>                       | Existing mains connection  |                          |  |
| <b>Proposed wastewater treatment system &amp; available capacity, other issues</b> | Packaged waste water treatment system and polishing filter   |                          |  |
| <b>Others?</b>   | n/a  |                          |  |

### 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) |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------------|--|---|--|
|                       |                 |                           |            |  |   |  |

| Groundwater body  | underground      | <b>Skibbereen-Clonakilty IE-SW-G-085 Ground Waterbody</b> | Good                       | Not at risk                                       | No pressures                         | Drainage to ground               |  |
|---|------------------|---|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Coastal   | 30               | <b>Roaring Water Bay EI-SW_140_0000</b>                   | Good                       | Not at risk                                       | No pressures                         | No identified pathway            |  |
| <b>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.</b> |                  |   |                            |   |                                      |                                  |  |
| <b>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</b>   |                  |   |                            |   |                                      |                                  |  |
| No.   | Component        | Water body receptor (EPA Code)                            | Pathway (existing and new) | Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact | Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*  | Residual Risk (yes/no)<br>Detail | <b>Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.</b> |
| 1.  | Groundwater body | <b>Skibbereen-Clonakilty IE-SW-G-085 Ground Waterbody</b> | underground                | spillages   | Standard good construction practices | no                               | Screened out   |
| 2.  | Coastal          | <b>Roaring Water Bay EI-SW_140_0000</b>                   | Run off                    | Pollution and sedimentation                       | Standard good construction practices | No                               | Screened out   |

| OPERATIONAL PHASE     |                  |   |             |                             |   |    |              |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|-------------|-----------------------------|---|----|--------------|
| 3.                    | Groundwater body | <b>Skibbereen-Clonakilty IE-SW-G-085 Ground Waterbody</b> | Underground | Pollution                   | WWTS to EPA CoP standards, polishing filter | No | Screened out |
| 4.                    | Coastal          | <b>Roaring Water Bay EI-SW_140_0000</b>                   | Run off     | Pollution and sedimentation | WWTS to EPA CoP standards, polishing filter | No | Screened out |
| DECOMMISSIONING PHASE |                  |   |             |                             |   |    |              |
| 5.                    | n/a              |   |             |                             |   |    |              |