

# ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

## TEN-T Priority Route Improvement Project, Donegal Chapter 15 - Material Assets: Agriculture



TT\_MGT0337-RPS-P3-ZZ-RP-E-EN0001

EIAR

March 2026

## Table of Contents

<b>15</b>	<b>MATERIAL ASSETS AGRICULTURE .....</b>	<b>15-1</b>
15.1	Introduction .....	15-1
15.2	Competent Expert .....	15-1
15.3	Methodology .....	15-2
	15.3.1 Impact Assessment Criteria .....	15-3
	15.3.2 Legislative Context .....	15-7
15.4	Consultation .....	15-8
15.5	Existing Environment .....	15-8
	15.5.1 Desktop Assessment .....	15-8
15.6	Field Assessment .....	15-13
	15.6.1 Section 1 .....	15-14
	15.6.2 Section 2 .....	15-15
	15.6.3 Section 3 .....	15-16
	15.6.4 Entire Proposed Development .....	15-17
15.7	Predicted Impacts .....	15-18
	15.7.1 Characteristics of the Proposed Development likely to Result in Significant Effects on the Environment .....	15-18
	15.7.2 Construction Phase impacts .....	15-18
	15.7.3 Operation Phase Impacts .....	15-19
	15.7.4 Do Nothing .....	15-21
	15.7.5 Project Wide Construction Phase Impacts .....	15-22
	15.7.6 Project Wide Operational Phase Impacts .....	15-22
15.8	Mitigation Measures .....	15-23
	15.8.1 Construction Phase Mitigation Measures .....	15-23
	15.8.2 Operational Phase Mitigation Measures .....	15-24
	15.8.3 Predicted Residual Impacts .....	15-24
15.9	Project Wide Effects .....	15-26
15.10	Transboundary Effects .....	15-26
15.11	Summary .....	15-26
15.12	References .....	15-46

## Tables

Table 15.1:	Assessment of Environmental Sensitivity – Agriculture .....	15-4
Table 15.2:	Criteria for the Assessment of Farm Enterprise Intensity .....	15-5
Table 15.3:	Criteria for the Assessment of Land Classification (MAFF, 1988) .....	15-6
Table 15.4:	Criteria for the Assessment of Severance/Division .....	15-6
Table 15.5:	Criteria for the Assessment of Facility Loss .....	15-6
Table 15.6:	Criteria for the Assessment of Magnitude - Agriculture .....	15-7
Table 15.7:	Matrix Used for the Assessment of the Significance of the Effect .....	15-7
Table 15.8:	2010 and 2020 Census of Agriculture Data - Farming in Donegal (CSO, 2010 and 2020) .....	15-9
Table 15.9:	Census of Agriculture Data - Section 1 .....	15-10
Table 15.10:	Percentage of Integrated Farming System (IFS) Soil Type Within the Landtake Area – Section 1 .....	15-10
Table 15.11:	Census of Agriculture Data - Section 2 .....	15-11
Table 15.12:	Percentage of IFS Soil Type within the Landtake Area – Section 2 .....	15-11
Table 15.13:	Census of Agriculture Data - Section 3 .....	15-12
Table 15.14:	Percentage of IFS Soil Type within the Landtake Area – Section 3 .....	15-13
Table 15.15:	Average Percentage of IFS Soil Type within the Landtake Area – Proposed Development .....	15-13

Table 15.16: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development.....	15-14
Table 15.17: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development.....	15-15
Table 15.18: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development.....	15-16
Table 15.19: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development.....	15-17
Table 15.20: Summary of Operational Impacts - Section 1.....	15-20
Table 15.21: Summary of Operational Impacts - Section 2.....	15-21
Table 15.22: Summary of Operational Impacts - Section 3.....	15-21
Table 15.23: Summary of Operational Impacts.....	15-22
Table 15.24: Summary of the Significance of the Impacts (Pre-Mitigation) and Nos.....	15-23
Table 15.25: Residual Impact and Nos. – Section 1 .....	15-25
Table 15.26: Residual Impact and Nos. – Section 2 .....	15-25
Table 15.27: Residual Impact and Nos. – Section 3 .....	15-25
Table 15.28: Residual Impact and Total Nos. ....	15-26
Table 15.29: Summary of Potential Environment Effects, Mitigation and Monitoring from an ED perspective .....	15-27
Table 15.30: Section 1 - Completed Assessments .....	15-28
Table 15.31: Section 2 - Completed Assessments .....	15-35
Table 15.32: Section 3 – Completed Assessment .....	15-41

## List of Abbreviations

The following is a list of abbreviations used within this chapter of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR).

List of Abbreviations	
A5 WTC	A5 Western Transport Corridor
CPO	Compulsory Purchase Order
CSO	Central Statistics Office
DAFM	Department of Agriculture Food and the Marine
DCC	Donegal County Council
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
ED	Electoral Divisions
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIAR	Environmental Impact Assessment Report
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
IAN	Interim Advice Note
IFS	Integrated Farming System
IPC	Integrated Pollution Control
IPPC	Integrated Pollution Prevention Control
LLO	Land Liaison Officers
LSU	Livestock Units
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (UK)
TEN-T PRIPD	Trans-European Network - Transport Priority Route Improvement Project, Donegal

## 15 MATERIAL ASSETS AGRICULTURE

### 15.1 Introduction

This chapter of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) identifies, describes and presents an assessment of the likely significant effects of the TEN-T Priority Route Improvement Project, Donegal (PRIPD) – hereafter the “Proposed Development” or “Project” - on agriculture during both the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development. The assessment presented is informed by Chapter 4: Project Description of the EIAR.

The assessment considers the potential effects that the Proposed Development may have on agricultural properties, practices and enterprises in the environs of the Project. Other aspects relevant to the agriculture assessment are addressed in other specific chapters of the EIAR, namely:

- **Chapter 6: Traffic & Transport Assessment** – Predicted construction traffic levels.
- **Chapter 7: Population** – Predicted impacts on population.
- **Chapter 8: Human Health** – Predicted effects on human health.
- **Chapter 9: Biodiversity** – Predicted effects on biodiversity.
- **Chapter 10: Land, Soil & Hydrogeology** – Predicted impacts on soils and loss of soil resource.
- **Chapter 12: Air Quality** – Predicted air quality effects.
- **Chapter 14: Noise & Vibration** – Predicted noise levels.

The technical assessment of soils and soil resource loss (including land take, sealing and potential loss of topsoil and organic matter) is presented in Chapter 10: Land, Soil & Hydrogeology; Chapter 15 therefore addresses the agricultural consequences of those land/soil impacts.

Landtake for the Proposed Development which affects non-agricultural properties (including dwellings) is assessed in Chapter 16 – Material Assets: Non-Agricultural.

The agriculture assessment has followed the guidance set out in Chapter 1: Introduction of the EIAR. Specific to the assessment, the following legislative and guidance documents have also been considered:

- Guide to Process and Code of Practice for National Road Project Planning and Acquisition of Property for National Roads (National Road's Authority, 2003)
- Census of Agriculture (Central Statistics Office, 2020)
- Irish Forest Service Soil Classification, (Teagasc & EPA, 2009)
- DMRB 2020, HE-DMRB-SE LA 104 Revision 1 Environmental assessment and monitoring (formerly HA 205/08, HD 48/08, IAN 125/15, and IAN 133/10). Revision 1 (Highways England, 2020)
- DMRB 2020, UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 112 Population and human health (Highways England, 2020)
- TII Population and Human Health Assessment of Proposed National Roads - Standard, December 2025 (PE-ENV-01108-02)
- Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF, 1988)

### 15.2 Competent Expert

Conrad Wilson is a Senior Associate and Lead Agronomist with RPS, has extensive project management experience and was project manager for many development projects that have successfully gone through planning, CPO and licencing processes. Conrad has also presented evidence as an expert witness on numerous projects and represented local authorities in claim disputes.

Conrad is also RPS's principal landowner consultant. He has worked on a wide range of projects involving environmental assessment, mediation between disputing parties and assessing the interactions of landuse and the receiving environment.

### 15.3 Methodology

The following aspects were considered in assessing the potential effects that the Proposed Development may have on agriculture:

- **Land to be acquired:** Landtake is one of the more significant impacts that can occur from a change in land use and agricultural perspective.
- **Area and orientation of lands severed:** Land severance/division can have a very significant impact, particularly where access to properties or agricultural facilities may be restricted or removed.
- **Intensity and viability of farming practices:** Intensity and viability of farming practices can vary considerably within an area and while there is a strong correlation between intensity and the farmer's own ability, it is also a function of a number of other factors including, but not limited to, the area farmed, enterprise type, soil type, aspect and topography.
- **Removal or severance/division of buildings and/or facilities:** Removal or severance/division of buildings and/or facilities will have a significant effect on properties. From an agricultural perspective, the significance of this effect is accentuated in dairy and high intensity facilities such as horticultural, pig or poultry units. The removal or severance/division of remote cattle/sheep handling facilities, while significant can generally be replaced and therefore be readily mitigated.
- **Farm enterprises:** Some farm enterprises are less able to absorb the effects of a road scheme and as such are more sensitive. Typically, these are farms associated with dairy or equine enterprises but, depending on landtake and severance/division, may also significantly affect other enterprises such as beef and tillage.

A road scheme may affect different farm enterprises as follows:

- **Dairy:** Dairying is one of the more profitable farming enterprises. Dairying in Ireland has seen a significant increase in intensification since the lifting of milk quotas in 2015. This has allowed this enterprise to rapidly expand, with a subsequent increase of milk production of almost 50% seen since the lifting of the quotas. This increase in milk production was achieved through both an increase in the productivity of the cow but also with an increase in cow numbers. Of the farms in Ulster, Donegal saw the greatest increase in cow numbers in this period, of some 33%.
  - These dairy farms, in this era of no quotas, are generally intensive with many of them requiring nitrate derogations - farms with greater than 170 kg organic nitrogen (ON) per hectare (ha) or in other words the equivalent of two or more cows per ha and, unlike many of their counterparts in Europe and the USA, these farms utilise a grass-based system focussed on careful grassland management and intensive grazing.
  - As such, these intensive farms require all of their lands to maintain high levels of productivity and therefore do not easily absorb the effects of a new road requiring landtake or severance/division. These farms generally have a primary grazing area, which is in close proximity of the milking facilities etc. and a landtake or severance/division of this area in particular can further increase the significance of the effects.
- **Poultry/ Pigs:** Both poultry and pigs are typically farmed in intensive units. While there are still a considerable number of mixed farms with poultry and/or pigs included, these enterprises are becoming more and more specialised and managed as single enterprise farms.
  - The units themselves are generally not extensive and likely to occupy a space of less than two hectares (ha). However, the spreadlands associated with these units can be extensive and access to these lands is of importance. The distance that needs to be travelled to these lands is also of importance and increased travel distances due to severance/division of a new road can have a negative effect.
- **Intensive poultry and pig units** exercise very strict disease control measures and access to these properties can be limited and requiring implementation of specific control measures before access is granted.

- **Tillage:** Tillage farming is not common in Sections 1 and 2 but is prevalent in Section 3. Tillage may not require daily or even weekly access, but they do require regular access and do require access that is suitable for large machinery. Furthermore, the effective operation of large machinery benefits from large square fields. Triangulation of a field due to severance/division or reduction in field size due to landtake may reduce the effective operation of large machinery.
- **Drystock:** Drystock farming (sheep, beef and sucklers) is one of the more common farm enterprises in the vicinity of all three sections. These animals, particularly the beef and sucklers, associated with this enterprise type are generally of a quiet disposition. These animals normally do not require moving on a daily basis but will require daily access and water, and facilities affected by a proposed project would have to be re-instated, even temporarily, as soon as is practicable unless otherwise agreed with the landowner.
- **Equine:** Horses, particularly thoroughbred horses are of a more nervous disposition than other stock types and are prone to stress caused by unaccustomed noise. There are no stud farms along the proposed options, but a number of farms do have sport horses and do partake in equine activities. The effects on equine activities are considered from two perspectives: the effects, if any, on the wellbeing of the horse and the effects, if any, on the wellbeing of persons in close interactions with the horse.
- **Forestry:** In recent years this enterprise has become more commonplace as an alternative farming enterprise. Once the forestry has been established the frequency that the area is visited is low. However, thinning or clear-fell operations will require the ability of large machinery to access the site. If, after landtake and severance/division, the size of the remaining areas is considered too small or awkward to operate large machinery then it may require a change in enterprise type.
  - Another impact that has to be considered when an area of forestry is to be acquired is “windblow”. Windblow affects new forestry boundaries where trees that were originally located in the centre of a block of forestry are now on the boundary and exposed to wind forces for which they are not accustomed and are therefore prone to being blown over. There are forestry blocks in the areas of the Proposed Development and access and potential effects to these properties will require assessment.
- **Horticulture:** Many of these enterprises by their nature are intensively managed producing a high value product. These enterprises may have associated facilities such as polyethylene tunnels, glass houses or specialised irrigation/feeding systems. Landtake, severance/division or loss of facilities will be a concern for these enterprise types and may significantly affect the viability of the enterprise.

All lands potentially affected by the Proposed Development have been walked by members of the Landowner Liaison Team and all landowners and/or their representatives or agents have been met for the purpose of understanding their current farming practices, identifying their concerns and issues, and assessing the potential effects that the Proposed Development may have on their lands and farming practices. The Landowner Liaison team consists of representatives from Donegal County Council along with a principal landowner consultant from RPS. All information collected by the DCC Land Liaison Officers (LLO) is thoroughly reviewed and compiled by the RPS consultant.

The land parcels considered in this assessment are shown in the land holding drawings that form part of Chapter 16: Material Assets Non-agricultural EIAR Drawings as they are relevant to both that assessment and this assessment. Reference should be made to EIAR Drawing series 16.01 (Section 1), 16.02 (Section 2) and 16.03 (Section 3) contained in Volume D: Book of Drawings.

### 15.3.1 Impact Assessment Criteria

The following tables Table 15.1 to Table 15.7 outline the criteria for considering the sensitivity of the various agricultural operations, the intensity of farm enterprises, and the effects that a loss of facilities or severance/division may have on a farm. The tables also outline the magnitude of an impact that a proposed development may have on agriculture and the significance of this impact on agriculture.

These criteria are broadly based on the requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency (2022) and the DMRB 2020, HE-DMRB-SE LA 104 Revision 1 Environmental assessment and monitoring (formerly HA 205/08, HD 48/08, IAN 125/15, and IAN 133/10). Revision 1. They also are based on the requirements from

DMRB 2020, UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 112 Population and human health (Highways England, 2020).

**Table 15.1: Assessment of Environmental Sensitivity – Agriculture**

Sensitivity	Definition
<b>High</b>	Stud farms
	Riding stables
	Dairy+
	Pig units+
	Poultry units
	Beef+
	Horticultural units
	Deer farms
<b>Medium</b>	Beef
	Sheep
	Dairy
	Horse (general)
	Vegetables
	Tillage
	Pig units
	Forestry
<b>Low</b>	Drystock
	Fodder conservation areas
<b>Negligible</b>	Commonage
	Fallow

**Table 15.2: Criteria for the Assessment of Farm Enterprise Intensity**

Enterprise	Description of Intensity	Score
<b>Livestock farms</b>	Only dairy farms in this category. Generally using paddock grazing systems. Expect to see extensive well managed sheds and intricate slurry management systems. All of these farms will be derogation farms <sup>1</sup> with stocking rates exceeding 170 kgN-ha.	Very Intense
	Primarily dairy farms which may be using paddock systems. Some beef enterprises may fit in this category. For these farms expect to see extensive well managed sheds and slurry systems. Some of these farms will be derogation farms with stocking rates >170 kgON-ha. Others, while not derogation farms, will be close to 170 kgON-ha threshold.	Intense
	Typical average dairy farm or good beef farm. Well run sheep farms will fit in this category. Reasonable grazing system and reasonable facilities. None of these will exceed the 170 kgON-ha threshold.	Moderate
	Dairy farms are unlikely to found in this categorisation. Typical beef or sheep farm will fit this categorisation and these farms will typically have limited facilities, if any.	Extensive
	Typically hill sheep farm with little or no 'green' grazing.	Low
<b>Tillage</b>	Large farms with mixture of cereals, proteins and vegetables. Extensive facilities for storage and/or drying	Very Intense
	Farms with mixture of cereals, proteins and vegetables. Limited facilities	Intense
	Farms with mixture of cereals, proteins and vegetables with no facilities	Moderate
	Farms with cereals only	Extensive
	Fallow ground	Low
	Intensity	Score
<b>Pig/Poultry Units</b>	Large units with large stock numbers and extensive facilities. These will all be Integrated Pollution Prevention Control (IPPC) licenced facilities <sup>2</sup> .	Very Intense
	Medium units with facilities. These facilities will be below licence thresholds	Intense
	Likely to form part of a mix of enterprises on a small scale	Moderate
	Not defined	Extensive
	Not defined	Low

<sup>1</sup> Lands where the application of livestock manure in any year exceeds the amount specified in Article 20(1) of S.I. No. 113 of 2022.

<sup>2</sup> Defined under the EPA Act 1992 (as amended) as poultry rearing installation where the capacity exceeds 40,000 places or the rearing of pigs in an installation where the capacity exceeds 750 places for sows, or 2,000 places for production pigs which are each over 30kg.

Agricultural land classification has been undertaken with regard to of the criteria outlined in the Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales (MAFF, 1988). The land classifications under this system are shown in Table 15.3.

**Table 15.3: Criteria for the Assessment of Land Classification (MAFF, 1988)**

Grade	Description
<b>Grade 1 - excellent quality agricultural land</b>	Land with no or very minor limitations to agricultural use. A very wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can be grown and commonly includes top fruit, soft fruit, salad crops and winter harvested vegetables. Yields are high and less variable than on land of lower quality.
<b>Grade 2 - very good quality agricultural land</b>	Land with minor limitations which affect crop yield, cultivations or harvesting. A wide range of agricultural and horticultural crops can usually be grown but on some land in the grade there may be reduced flexibility due to difficulties with the production of the more demanding crops such as winter harvested vegetables and arable root crops. The level of yield is generally high but may be lower or more variable than Grade 1
<b>Grade 3 - good to moderate quality agricultural land</b>	Land with moderate limitations which affect the choice of crops, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or the level of yield. Where more demanding crops are grown yields are generally lower or more variable than on land in Grades 1 and 2.
<b>Subgrade 3a - good quality agricultural land</b>	Land capable of consistently producing moderate to high yields of a narrow range of arable crops, especially cereals, or moderate yields of a wide range of crops including cereals, grass, oilseed rape, potatoes, sugar beet and the less demanding horticultural crops.
<b>Subgrade 3b - moderate quality agricultural land</b>	Land capable of producing moderate yields of a narrow range of crops, principally cereals and grass or lower yields of a wider range of crops or high yields of grass which can be grazed or harvested over most of the year.
<b>Grade 4 - poor quality agricultural land</b>	Land with severe limitations which significantly restrict the range of crops and/or level of yields. It is mainly suited to grass with occasional arable crops (e.g., cereals and forage crops) the yields of which are variable. In moist climates, yields of grass may be moderate to high but there may be difficulties in utilisation. The grade also includes very droughty arable land.
<b>Grade 5 - very poor-quality agricultural land</b>	Land with very severe limitations which restrict use to permanent pasture or rough grazing, except for occasional pioneer forage crops.

**Table 15.4: Criteria for the Assessment of Severance/Division**

Category	Severance Description
<b>Low</b>	Assessment of severance or division to consider number of plots affected, current farm practices and suitability of access, if available.
<b>Medium</b>	Small division/severance on non-intensive farms where adequate access can be provided –
<b>High</b>	'Low'. Large division/severance of multiple plots on intensive farm – 'High'

**Table 15.5: Criteria for the Assessment of Facility Loss**

Category	Facilities Description
<b>Low</b>	Loss of 'in-field' animal handling facility.
<b>Medium</b>	Loss of out farm fodder or slurry storage facility.
<b>High</b>	Loss of milking parlour, equine training facility or critical fodder or storage facility.

**Table 15.6: Criteria for the Assessment of Magnitude - Agriculture**

Magnitude of impact	Definition
<b>High</b>	Large landtake and/or severance/division limiting current land use and farming practices in this area.
<b>Medium</b>	Large landtake and/or severance/division requiring a considerable change in current practices and associated costs.
<b>Low</b>	Small landtake and/or severance/division. Small change in current practices and additional costs, if any.
<b>Negligible</b>	Slight encroachment on the property. No change in current practices and no additional cost.

**Table 15.7: Matrix Used for the Assessment of the Significance of the Effect**

		Magnitude of impact			
		Negligible	Low	Medium	High
Sensitivity of Receptor	Negligible	Imperceptible	Imperceptible or slight	Imperceptible or slight	Slight
	Low	Imperceptible or slight	Imperceptible or slight	Slight	Slight or moderate
	Medium	Imperceptible or slight	Slight	Moderate	Moderate or major
	High	Slight	Slight or moderate	Moderate or major	Major or Profound

For the purposes of this assessment a description on the significance of effect levels has been provided as follows:

- **Profound** - The Proposed Development is such that the current land use can no longer continue and no mitigation measures in the form of accommodation works can overcome the impact to allow any current land use activities to continue in this location.
- **Major** - The Proposed Development is such that while a level of current land use can continue, no mitigation measures in the form of accommodation works can overcome the impact.
- **Moderate** - The Proposed Development requires a significant change in current land use activities with associated costs due to severance/division, land take, loss of buildings and/or disturbance. The level of impact requires considerable mitigation in the form of accommodation works and not all difficulties are negated.
- **Slight** - The Proposed Development causes a level of inconvenience and/or disturbance but does not require a change in current land use activities or day to day management. Mitigation in the form of accommodation works would overcome any problems.
- **Imperceptible** - The Proposed Development is encroaching slightly on a property boundary causing a slight inconvenience and/or creates a small level of disturbance but there are no noticeable consequences in the day-to-day management or current land use activities.

### 15.3.2 Legislative Context

Agriculture is not mentioned, per se, in the relevant legislation but the requirement to consider and assess the effects of a proposed development on the elements of which agriculture may be considered to comprise, namely material assets and land, are prescribed in the Roads Act 1993 as amended.

Land is a factor to be identified, described and assessed in an EIA, as required under Directive 2011/92/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 as amended by Directive 2014/52/EU

of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 (hereafter the EIA Directive) and information to be submitted and assessed as part of an EIAR in respect of land should include details of 'land take' and land use requirements of the whole project during the construction and operational phases (Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government, 2018). Given that this is a roads-based project, the Roads Act 1993, as amended must also be referenced as the Act specifically governs the EIA process for road schemes in Ireland.

## 15.4 Consultation

Dedicated LLOs for each section as part of the overall LLO team have met with all landowners, with a number of landowners engaged on multiple occasions. In addition to this, all landowners whose properties are affected 'moderately' or greater (112), and who wished to meet, have been met by the Project Agronomist.

All the data collated from these meetings has been fed back to the design team and these communications have influenced the overall design of the Proposed Development.

## 15.5 Existing Environment

A desktop assessment was undertaken to gather data on farming practices within County Donegal but also within each of the three sections of the Proposed Development, that is:

- **Section 1** – N15/N13 Ballybofey/ Stranorlar Urban Region
- **Section 2** – N56/N13 Letterkenny to Manorcunningham
- **Section 3** – N14 Manorcunningham to Lifford / Strabane/ A5 Link

Data was obtained from various sources as outlined below. The assessment considered the effects on agriculture from the following perspectives:

- **Regional Perspective** - At the regional level, the assessment examined the overall agricultural profile of County Donegal. This included an analysis of the predominant types of farming, such as livestock and crop production, as well as the land use patterns across the county.
- **Local Perspective** - The local analysis focused on the specific Electoral Divisions (EDs) that will be affected by the Proposed Development. This involved evaluating the extent of agricultural land within these EDs and identifying the types of farming practices prevalent in each area. The assessment considered potential impacts on local farming operations, including changes in access to fields, disruption of farming activities, and the potential for land fragmentation.
- **Individual Perspective** - The individual perspective involved a closer examination of specific farms that may be directly impacted by the Proposed Development. This included identifying key farms within the affected areas, assessing their size and type of agricultural practices. The assessment also considered the potential for loss of land, changes in access routes, and any operational challenges that farmers may face as a result of the road construction.

### 15.5.1 Desktop Assessment

Donegal has a rich history in farming and is famed for its production of disease-free seed potatoes. While the production of seed potatoes in Donegal has dropped off in recent years, the tradition of growing potatoes is still there, particularly in the region of the Finn valley in which Section 3 is largely located. There are still approximately 4,372 ha under cereals in Donegal and approximately 920.51 ha of potatoes (Central Statistics Office, 2020) and the majority of the farms associated with these tillage operations are situated in the region of the Finn valley.

Table 15.8 shows the main farm practices in Donegal. From this table it can be seen that most of the farming in Donegal revolves around the grazing of drystock in the form of sheep or beef cattle with c. 90% of the farms in Donegal involved in drystock in one way or another. According to the 2020 census Donegal contained the largest number of sheep with just over 6,000 farms and 750,000 Sheep. In addition, Donegal, with 44.9% was one of four counties in the country with over 20% of farms classified as specialist sheep.

The county has a relatively small dairy sector. As mentioned previously in this assessment, since 2015, and the lifting of milk quotas, there has been a considerable increase in the number of dairy cows despite the farms specialising in dairying remaining relatively the same. In 2010 there were 180 farms specialising in dairying with 15,456 cows in Donegal (Central Statistics Office, 2012), whereas in 2020 there were 183 farms specialising in dairying with 22,156 cows (Central Statistics Office, 2020), an increase of some 43%.

There were some 88 pig herds in the county in 2020 with approximately 52,100 animals associated with these farms. This figure is an increase on the 2010 Census of Agriculture which showed that Donegal had 60 pig herds in the county with approximately 38,525 animals associated with these farms, an increase of 47% and 35% respectively. There is only one farm in Donegal requiring an Integrated Pollution Control (IPC) Licence from the EPA and that is a pig farm with an address that is outside of the study area.

A total of 273 poultry farms are identified in Donegal in the Central Statistics Office (CSO) 2020 statistics. Of these, the majority, 246, have laying stock.

Lastly, horses have always been a feature of the Donegal agricultural landscape and in 2025 there are four registered trainers in the county with Horse Racing Ireland Rás (Horse Racing Ireland Ireland, n.d.)<sup>3</sup>.

Horse riding for pleasure is popular and there are numerous horse-riding stables throughout the county, and farms with sporting horses.

**Table 15.8: 2010 and 2020 Census of Agriculture Data - Farming in Donegal (CSO, 2010 and 2020)**

Enterprise Type	Number of Farms 2010	Percentage of Total 2010	Number of Farms 2020	Percentage of Total 2020
Specialist Tillage	141	1.5%	103	1.1%
Specialist Dairy	180	1.9%	183	2.0%
Specialist Beef Production	3,462	37.5%	3,069	32.8%
Specialist Sheep	3,393	36.7%	4,193	44.9%
Mixed Grazing Livestock	1,163	12.6%	972	10.4%
Mixed Crops and Livestock	140	1.5%	87	0.9%
Mixed field crops	704	7.6%	674	7.2%
Other	57	0.6%	103	1.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,240</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>2.0%</b>

### 15.5.1.1 Section 1

#### Agricultural Enterprise Types

The proposed route for Section 1 traverses two Electoral Divisions (ED), Dooish (33136) and Stranorlar (33147). The census for agriculture data (Central Statistics Office, 2020) for these two EDs is shown in Table 15.9. From this table it can be seen that grass was the predominant crop.

From this data presented it would appear that sheep and beef are the predominant enterprises in the EDs in 2020.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.hri-ras.ie/information-centre/industry/trainers/>

**Table 15.9: Census of Agriculture Data - Section 1**

Agriculture data	CSO Area Code ED 33136	CSO Area Code ED 33147	
Electoral Divisions	Dooish	Stranorlar	Total
Number of holdings	58	112	170
Average Size of Holding (ha)	23.8	19.5	43.3
Median Age of Holder	57.5	55	56.25
Land Utilisation	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	Total Area (ha)
<b>Total Cereals</b>			
All Grassland	1,368.8	2,151.6	3,520.4
All Area Farmed	1,381.1	2,183.1	3,564.2
Livestock	No. of Heads	No. of Heads	Total No. of Heads
Total Cattle	541	2,092	2,633
Other Cows	197	411	608
Total Sheep	3,729	6,173	9,902
Livestock Units (LSU)	733	1,963	2,696

## Soil Types

**Table 15.10** shows the percentage area for different soil types within the landtake area for Section 1. From this it can be seen that much of the land is poorly drained mineral or peat soils. This is a limiting factor for farming in this section and is consistent with the farming practices observed in the area. Further information regarding soil types is provided in Chapter 10: Land, Soil & Hydrogeology.

**Table 15.10: Percentage of Integrated Farming System (IFS<sup>4</sup>) Soil Type Within the Landtake Area – Section 1**

IFS Soil Type	Percentage of Area
Alluviums	2.28%
Deep poorly drained mineral	67.18%
Deep well drained mineral	19.22%
Miscellaneous	0.46%
Peats	6.52%
Poorly drained mineral soils with peaty topsoil	1.45%
Shallow well drained mineral	2.90%

<sup>4</sup> Irish Forest Services Soil Classification (produced from the project of soils and subsoils data generated by Teagasc with co-operation of the IFS, the EPA and the GSI, completed May 2006).

## 15.5.1.2 Section 2

### Agricultural Enterprise Types

The proposed route for Section 2 traverses two EDs, Letterkenny Urban (33105) and Magheraboy (33106). The proposed route ends in the Manorcunningham ED (33107). However, the area of this ED potentially affected is small and the exclusion of the data from this EDs is not significant. The census for agriculture data (Central Statistics Office, 2020) for these two EDs is shown in Table 15.11. From this table it can be seen that grass is the predominant crop and sheep the predominant enterprise.

**Table 15.11: Census of Agriculture Data - Section 2**

Agriculture data	CSO Area Code ED 33105	CSO Area Code ED 33106	
Electoral Divisions	Letterkenny Rural	Magheraboy	Total
Number of holdings	15	73	88
Average Size of Holding (ha)	29	22.8	25.9
Median Age of Holder	45	58	51.5
Land Utilisation	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	Total Area (ha)
<b>Total Cereals</b>			
All Grassland	455.0	1,607.9	2,062.9
All Area Farmed	584.8	1,666.9	2,251.7
Livestock	No. of Heads	No. of Heads	Total No. of Heads
<b>Total Cattle</b>	861	2,227	3,088
<b>Dairy Cows</b>			
Other Cows	142		142
<b>Total Sheep</b>	961	5,343	6,304
<b>Livestock Units (LSU)</b>	632	1,937	2,569

### Soil Types

Table 15.12 shows the percentage area for different soil types within the landtake area of Section 2. From this it can be seen that approximately 45% of the land is poorly drained mineral or peat soils. This is a limiting factor for farming in this section and is consistent with the farming practices observed in the area. The remaining land is a mix of alluviums, miscellaneous and shallow soils. These are the better soils in this section. Further information regarding soil types is provided in Chapter 10: Land, Soil & Hydrogeology.

**Table 15.12: Percentage of IFS Soil Type within the Landtake Area – Section 2**

IFS Soil Type	Percentage of Area
Alluviums	22.56%
Deep poorly drained mineral	39.89%
Deep well drained mineral	20.04%
Miscellaneous	10.73%
Poorly drained mineral soils with peaty topsoil	5.46%
Shallow well drained mineral	1.32%

### 15.5.1.3 Section 3

#### Agricultural Enterprise Types

The proposed route for Section 3 traverses four EDs, Kinraigy (33104), Clonleigh North (33133), Clonleigh South (33134) and Feddyglass (33137). The proposed route also touches off two other EDs, Manorcunningham (33107) and Treantaghmucklagh (33148). However, the area of these EDs potentially affected is small and the exclusion of the data from these EDs is not significant. The census for agriculture data (Central Statistics Office, 2020) for these four affected EDs is shown in Table 15.13.

There were considerable numbers of dairy cows in these EDs in 2020 (3,714). However, from this data it would appear that sheep and beef were the predominant enterprises in 2020. There is a considerable area of tillage (both cereals and potatoes) practiced in this section today

**Table 15.13: Census of Agriculture Data - Section 3**

Agriculture data	CSO Area Code ED33104	CSO Area Code ED 33133	CSO Area Code ED33137	CSO Area Code ED 33134	
Electoral Divisions	Kinraigy	Clonleigh North	Fedyglass	Clonleigh South	Total
<b>Number of holdings</b>	100	63	38	53	254
<b>Average Size of Holding (ha)</b>	22	35.2	43	36.9	34.3
<b>Median Age of Holder</b>	49	52	54	53	52
Land Utilisation	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	Area (ha)	Total Area (ha)
<b>Total Cereals</b>		333.1	224.6	166.6	724.3
<b>All Grassland</b>	2,036.7	1,822.3	1,285.3	1,763.4	6,907.7
<b>All Area Farmed</b>	2,199.1	2,219.8	1,637.7	1,954.3	8,010.9
Livestock	No. of Heads	No. of Heads	No. of Heads	No. of Heads	Total No. of Heads
<b>Total Cattle</b>	3,666	4,496	3,323	4,784	16,269
<b>Dairy Cows</b>	413	988	935	1,378	3,714
<b>Other Cows</b>	376	360	142	432	1,310
<b>Total Sheep</b>	6,524	2,830	1,440	1,985	12,779
<b>LSU</b>	3,028	3,595	7,488	4,955	19,066

#### Soil Types

Table 15.14 shows the percentage area for different soil types within the landtake area of Section 3. From this it can be seen that there is a higher percentage of well drained mineral soils in this section. This is reflected in the farming practices of this section where a greater percentage of tillage is practiced. Further information regarding soil types is provided in Chapter 10: Land, Soil & Hydrogeology.

**Table 15.14: Percentage of IFS Soil Type within the Landtake Area – Section 3**

IFS Soil Type	Percentage of Area
Alluviums	17.76%
Deep poorly drained mineral	36.50%
Deep well drained mineral	42.44%
Miscellaneous	0.07%
Poorly drained mineral soils with peaty topsoil	0.96%
Shallow well drained mineral	2.19%

#### 15.5.1.4 Entire Proposed Development

Table 15.15 shows the average percentage area for different IFS soil types within the landtake area for the entire Proposed Development (all three sections). From this it can be seen that much of the land is comprised of poorly drained mineral soils and peats, which is a limiting factor for farming across the route and is consistent with observed farming practices. Section 3 contains a higher proportion of well-drained mineral soils, reflected in the greater extent of tillage there. The remaining land is a mix of deep well-drained mineral soils, alluviums, miscellaneous and shallow well-drained mineral soils, which represent the better soils in the study area. Further information regarding soil types is provided in Chapter 10: Land, Soil & Hydrogeology.

**Table 15.15: Average Percentage of IFS Soil Type within the Landtake Area – Proposed Development**

IFS Soil Type	Average Percentage of Area
Alluviums	14.20%
Deep poorly drained mineral	47.86%
Deep well drained mineral	27.23%
Miscellaneous	3.75%
Poorly drained mineral soils with peaty topsoil	2.17%
Shallow well drained mineral	2.62%

## 15.6 Field Assessment

The in-field surveys were carried out by the LLOs through a series of data gathering meetings with landowners and/or their agents or representatives. A walkover of the preferred corridor was also undertaken. The information gathered from the in-field surveys was then collated with folio data obtained from the Tailte Eireann website and IFS soil survey data, in a GIS database. The data from these sources was reviewed by the Project Agronomist and where additional detail or further understanding was required, the Project Agronomist met with landowners and walked properties. The detail from these meetings, and the review of the data, fed into the design process. In particular accommodation requirements were considered on a farm-by-farm basis and where possible the landowners needs were agreed and are shown in the engineer drawings. Furthermore, the aforementioned data sources fed into the overall, and individual assessments that were undertaken.

The following sections provide further detail of the current farming practices within the Proposed Development (sections 1 to 3) obtained during the meetings with these landowners and the walkover surveys and the detailed individual assessments.

### 15.6.1 Section 1

While Table 15.9 gives indication of the farming practices in the area Table 15.16 provides greater detail on the actual number of farms and type of primary enterprise that are potentially affected by the Proposed Development in Section 1.

**Table 15.16: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development**

Primary Enterprise Type	No.	Area within Landtake (ha)
Stud Farms	0	0.00
Riding stables	0	0.00
Poultry unit	0	0.00
Dairy+	0	0.00
Pig units+	0	0.00
Horticulture	2	3.85
Deer farms	0	0.00
Beef+	0	0.00
Dairy	3	4.14
Vegetables	0	0.00
Pig units	0	0.00
Forestry	6	13.67
Sheep	40	64.94
Drystock	5	0.27
Beef	37	113.84
Horses	1	0.10
Fodder	0	0.00
Tillage	2	0.60
Fallow	1	0.97
NA	1	0.1
Scrub	1	0.05
Commonage	0	0.00

## 15.6.2 Section 2

While Table 15.11 gives indication of the farming practices in the area, Table 15.17 provides greater detail on the actual number of farms and type of primary enterprise that are potentially affected by the Proposed Development in Section 2.

**Table 15.17: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development**

Primary Enterprise Type	No.	Area within Landtake (ha)
Stud Farms	0	0.0
Riding stables	0	0.0
Poultry unit	0	0.0
Dairy+	0	0.0
Pig units+	0	0.0
Horticulture	0	0.0
Deer farms	0	0.0
Beef+	6	22.2
Dairy	2	2.43
Vegetables	0	0.0
Pig units	0	0.0
Forestry	1	11.7
Sheep	9	13.20
Drystock	31	23.31
Beef	14	24.93
Horses	2	2.8
Fodder	0	0.0
Tillage	0	0.0
Scrub	2	5.49
NA	1	0.12
Fallow	4	0.37
Commonage	0	0.0

### 15.6.3 Section 3

While Table 15.13 gives indication of the farming practices in the area, Table 15.18 provides greater detail on the actual number of farms and type of primary enterprise that are potentially affected by the Proposed Development in Section 3.

**Table 15.18: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development**

Primary Enterprise Type	No.	Area within Landtake (ha)
Stud Farms	0	0.0
Riding stables	0	0.0
Poultry unit	0	0.0
Dairy+	7	26.99
Pig units+	0	0.0
Horticulture	0	0.0
Deer farms	0	0.0
Beef+	0	0.0
Dairy	9	33.93
Vegetables	1	5.28
Pig units	1	5.7
Forestry	1	3.2
Sheep	10	23.2
Drystock	8	10.64
Beef	26	72.19
Horses	3	8.1
Fodder	4	19.34
Tillage	11	61.42
Fallow	1	0.9
Scrub	3	0.57
Other	1	0.18
Commonage	0	0.0

### 15.6.4 Entire Proposed Development

Table 15.19 provides greater detail on the combined number of farms and the types of primary enterprise across Sections 1, 2 and 3 that are potentially affected by the Proposed Development.

**Table 15.19: Primary Enterprise Type Potentially Affected by the Proposed Development**

Primary Enterprise Type	No.	Area within Landtake (ha)
Stud Farms	0	0
Riding stables	0	0
Poultry unit	0	0
Dairy+	7	26.99
Pig units+	0	0
Horticulture	2	3.85
Deer farms	0	0
Beef+	6	22.2
Dairy	14	40.51
Vegetables	1	5.5
Pig units	1	5.7
Forestry	8	28.56
Sheep	59	101.35
Drystock	43	34.19
Beef	77	210.96
Horses	6	11.03
Fodder	4	19.13
Tillage	13	62.02
Fallow	6	2.23
NA	2	0.12
Scrub	6	6.11
Other	1	0.18
Commonage	0	0

## 15.7 Predicted Impacts

### 15.7.1 Characteristics of the Proposed Development likely to Result in Significant Effects on the Environment

The effects of a proposed development on agriculture are generally considered and assessed under two main headings, those associated with the construction works, which are usually temporary in nature (for the duration of construction) and those associated with the actual operation of the new road, which include landtake and severance/ division, and are permanent. The effects of the Proposed Development were discussed with the individual landowners and/or their agents and considered in the walkover surveys.

### 15.7.2 Construction Phase impacts

The following section provides an overview of the likely construction impacts that will affect agriculture in all three sections:

1. **Noise** – There will be an increase in noises during the construction of these roads. For most agricultural enterprises this increase in noise will have little or no effect, and animals will quickly become habituated to these new noises. However, for certain agricultural enterprises, where the animals are more highly strung, and with increased ‘flight or fight’ responses, such as poultry or horses, the effects of noise can be greater. The significance of the effect can be further exacerbated where there is a close interaction between humans and large animals, such as horse riding.
2. **Dust** – Without mitigation the activity of construction machinery can generate dust in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Development. The proliferation of dust has a nuisance value and livestock are at risk to eye irritations from high levels of wind-blown dust particles. Dust and other particulate matter deposited onto crops, may also impact the quality of these crops. This is particularly relevant to those crops consumed raw such as fruits or salads.
3. **Construction Traffic** – There will be an increase in construction traffic along local roads during the construction phases of the Proposed Development, which has the potential to interface with agricultural traffic, particularly during periods of harvesting. It should be noted that the period for harvesting in Section 3 will potentially extend from the end of May for first crop silage, to October (and possibly later) for main/late crop potatoes.
4. **Drainage** – As a linear Project, an offline road scheme will potentially sever or disturb in-situ field drainage systems during construction. This disturbance may lead to wet or flooded fields during spells of wet weather, potentially reducing farm productivity.
5. **Soils** – The structure of soils within temporary construction and access areas will be potentially affected from being trafficked by construction vehicles. The potential to damage soil structures will become more pronounced when construction activities occur during wet periods.
6. **Disturbance of Services (Water and Electrical Facilities)** – The construction of the Proposed Development will potentially disturb or sever current piped water supplies for livestock where the road crosses these piped supplies. Access to surface drinking points will also be potentially severed or curtailed during construction. Furthermore, many farms utilise electric fencing to manage stock. In some instances, the electric fencing will be supplied by a battery-operated system, which will not be affected. However, many farms utilise a mains supply to operate their electric fencing and severance/division of this connectivity from the supply to the fence will impact negatively on the management of the farm.
7. **Division/Severance**– The effects of division or severance are considered in the operational section of this report and on an individual basis. However, temporary division or severance during construction will also potentially occur. The effects of temporary access are primarily a function of the enterprise type but also the management practices and the time of occurrence. For all farms, division or severance, even temporary, during harvesting periods will potentially be significant. For dairy farms, in addition to harvesting areas being divided or severed, division or severance to the primary grazing platform, even

temporary, will also be potentially significant. While the movement of stock on drystock farms is less frequent, daily access will be required to a divided or severed field with stock to check on their welfare.

8. **Spread of Disease or Pests** – As a linear project, the construction of the Proposed Development has the potential for spreading both plant and animal disease between fields and farms. The spread of disease may occur by carrying contaminated material on either machines or personnel from an infected farm (even from infected farms on a previous scheme) to a clean one. The risk of disease spread will potentially be more significant in intensive poultry and pig units but also within closed herds<sup>5</sup> of cattle (including dairy animals) and/or sheep. The main animal diseases that need to be considered during the construction of these roads can be found in the following web site <https://www.agriculture.gov.ie/animalhealthwelfare/diseasecontrol/>. The transfer of plant diseases between crops due to the construction of these roads, while possible, is not considered significant. There are a number of soil borne pests that may be transferred and that may potentially give rise to a significant effect. This will only occur when contaminated soil adhering to a construction machine is deposited in a clean field growing a susceptible crop. In most instances this will be unlikely, and even if it should occur will not be significant. However, where high cost/value susceptible crops are grown then the effect of the transfer of a soil borne pest by a construction machine will potentially be significant.

### 15.7.3 Operation Phase Impacts

The following section provides an overview of the likely operation impacts that will affect agriculture in all three sections.

1. **Landtake** - The primary effect of any proposed road development project on an agricultural property is landtake. This was the number one concern expressed by most landowners during discussions with LLOs. The assessment considered how the proposed landtake will affect agriculture from a regional, local and individual perspective.

The area of land required for the Proposed Development will not have a significant effect on Irish agriculture when considered at a national or regional level as the landtake represents 0.01% of the total agricultural area for the country and 0.2% of the total agricultural area for Donegal. However, from a local or individual perspective landtake can be significant. This is particularly relevant on intensive well-established farms where the loss of land can increase management costs, reduce productivity and require, in some extreme cases, a change from an intensive, and possibly more profitable enterprise, to one that is less profitable. Typically, these farms are more 'sensitive' to change and therefore less able to absorb the effects of a new scheme. The sensitivity of various farming practices is outlined above in **Table 15.1** and this, together with a number of other factors, allow the significance of the effect on individual properties to be assessed.

2. **Division/Severance** – This is the second biggest concern expressed by landowners during discussions with the LLOs. Again, similar to landtake, some farms and farming practices are better able to absorb the effects of division and/or severance. Furthermore, the significance of the effect is also a function of where the division/severance occurs in relation to facilities or primary grazing. As a general planning guide, access provision will normally be provided to divided/severed portions of land greater than 0.25 ha in size. This figure is an indicative threshold only and will be considered alongside parcel function, enterprise type, parcel shape and location, existing access points, presence of farm infrastructure, and operational requirements (e.g., silage or cropping areas, accommodation lanes and gateways). Smaller parcels (<0.25 ha) that perform critical operational roles (for example gateways, access strips, silage clamps or connectivity to other holdings) will be provided with appropriate access or other mitigation as required. Decisions on retention of, or access to, severed land will be made on a parcel-by-parcel basis taking account of agricultural practicality and the statutory tests relevant to acquisition.

How access can be provided to divided or severed portions is also of considerable interest to landowners. Overbridges and/or underpasses are generally the preferred choice of the landowner but

<sup>5</sup> A herd of farm animals that is 100% born and raised on a single farm to ensure the health of the herd. No additional animals are brought in from the outside.

may not be viable from a technical or economic perspective. Access to divided or severed portions will be considered in the overall assessment of effects and details will be agreed with landowners during discussions regarding accommodation works.

3. **Area Based Entitlements** – Most agricultural lands in this country are linked to some form of entitlement and the most common of these entitlements relates to the Basic Payment Scheme. This scheme acts as a key support to EU farmers and is granted on the condition that farmers adhere to strict rules on human and animal health and welfare, plant health, and the environment. It aims to provide basic income support to farmers and contribute to viable food production in the EU without distorting production decisions. The Basic Payment Scheme is designed to provide farmers with an income safety net, the amount of support received is not linked to the quantities produced (DAFM, July 2020<sup>6</sup>).

The Basic Payment Scheme entitlements are not attached to land; however, a farmer must declare one eligible hectare of land to draw down each entitlement held. Therefore, while a loss of eligible land through the scheme of this Project will not extinguish entitlements under the Basic Payment Scheme, it will reduce the farmer's ability to claim payments proportionally to the land lost. This effect can be more significant for other forms of entitlement that are directly correlated with the area of eligible land such as the Young Farmers Scheme<sup>7</sup>. In this instance a loss of land, leads to a loss of entitlement.

4. **Loss of Facilities** – The loss of facilities can vary considerably, from minor facilities such as remote cattle or sheep handling facilities to major facilities such as slurry storage facilities or milking parlours.

The location of these facilities was identified early in the project and avoidance, where possible, was the preferred option for all major facilities. Any loss of facilities critical to farm operations, such as access routes or storage buildings, will potentially have a negative effect on the operation of a farm. For example, removal of a livestock holding facility will potentially have a greater impact on a smaller land holding than larger land holdings. Where there is a requirement to remove more minor facilities and their removal is also likely to have a significant effect, they are considered in the assessment of effects.

### 15.7.3.1 Section 1

Table 15.20 provides a summary of the operation impacts on agriculture in Section 1. The assessment on individual farms is shown in Table 15.30.

**Table 15.20: Summary of Operational Impacts - Section 1**

Description	Nos.
No. of Landowners Affected	99
Total Landtake (ha)	202.438
No. of Folios Severed	39
No. of Facilities Affected	4
No. of Folios Requiring Access	78

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-agriculture-food-and-the-marine/services/basic-payment-scheme/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-agriculture-food-and-the-marine/services/young-farmers-scheme/>

### 15.7.3.2 Section 2

Table 15.21 provides a summary of the operation impacts on agriculture in Section 2. The assessment on individual farms is shown in Table 15.31.

**Table 15.21: Summary of Operational Impacts - Section 2**

Description	Nos.
No. of Landowners Affected	72
Total Landtake (ha)	106.66
No. of Folios Severed	18
No. of Facilities Affected	2
No. of Folios Requiring Access	43

### 15.7.3.3 Section 3

Table 15.22 provides a summary of the operation impacts on agriculture in Section 3. The assessment on individual farms is shown in Table 15.32.

**Table 15.22: Summary of Operational Impacts - Section 3**

Description	Nos.
No. of Landowners Affected	86
Total Landtake (ha)	271.487
No. of Folios Severed	27
No. of Facilities Affected	0
No. of Folios Requiring Access	44

## 15.7.4 Do Nothing

Agricultural practices by their very nature change over time. In the last one hundred years there has been considerable change in farming in Ireland with average farm sizes increasing while numbers of people involved directly with farming, decreasing.

The size of an average farm in Donegal quadrupled over the last century, rising from 7 ha in 1915, to 28 ha in 2010 (Central Statistics Office, 2016). In part these changes are driven by improved science and technologies but also by socio economics and policy. Furthermore, and unusual for Ireland, the area farmed in Donegal has increased in the last hundred years from 204,000 ha in 1916 to 258,000 ha in 2010. However, this trend has now stopped and the change in land use is now one from an agricultural land use to one of residential and commercial development (and other) and this is likely to be the future trend.

### 15.7.4.1 Section 1

Section 1 is close to, and partially encompasses, the urban settlements and environs of Ballybofey/Stranorlar. Significant land use changes from agriculture to developed land, whether commercial or residential housing, has occurred in this section. This demand, while somewhat dependent on Ireland's economic status, is likely to continue regardless of whether the Proposed Development goes ahead or not.

### 15.7.4.2 Section 2

This section is contiguous and interwoven with the major conurbation Letterkenny and considerable changes in land usage from agriculture to residential or commercial has occurred in the section over the last twenty years and will continue to occur as demand increases. Therefore, this section will see land use changes over the coming years from agriculture usage to other usage (primarily commercial) regardless of whether the Proposed Development goes ahead or not.

### 15.7.4.3 Section 3

This section is more rural than Sections 1 and 2 and, while there will continue to be some development of rural housing, the overall change in land use is likely to be small. Therefore, should the Proposed Development not occur in this section then it is likely that land use in this section will largely remain the same but will continue to see small changes relating to the development of rural housing in the future.

## 15.7.5 Project Wide Construction Phase Impacts

An overall assessment of the construction phase impacts on agriculture for the Proposed Development has been undertaken. The Project as a whole will result in temporary disruption to farming activities, including potential restrictions to farm access, dust and noise generation, and temporary loss of productive land during construction. These impacts have been carefully considered alongside permanent land take and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed to minimise adverse effects on agricultural operations throughout the construction period.

## 15.7.6 Project Wide Operational Phase Impacts

Whilst every effort has been made to minimise the impact on agriculture, there will be a total of approximately 593 ha of agricultural land that will be permanently removed from agricultural production for the Proposed Development. In addition to land take, other operational impacts on agriculture across the project as a whole may include changes to farming practices adjacent to the road, potential restrictions or alterations to farm access, effects on drainage and water management, and possible disturbance from noise and dust. These impacts have been considered and assessed where relevant, and appropriate mitigation measures proposed to minimise adverse effects on agricultural operations.

A summary of the Project wide effects of the operational phase of the Proposed Development is summarised in Table 15.23.

**Table 15.23: Summary of Operational Impacts**

Description	No.s
No. of Landowners Affected	257
Total Landtake (ha)	580.56
No. of Folios Severed	84
No. of Facilities Affected	6
No. of Folios Requiring Access	164

A summary of the significance of effects across all sections of the Proposed Development is summarised in Table 15.24.

**Table 15.24: Summary of the Significance of the Impacts (Pre-Mitigation) and Nos.**

Significance	No.s
Imperceptible	13
Slight	76
Moderate	74
Major	80
Profound	14

## 15.8 Mitigation Measures

### 15.8.1 Construction Phase Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures have been considered on a farm-by-farm basis and details of specific measures that are required for individual properties are shown in Table 15.30 through Table 15.32. However, there are a number of measures that will be implemented across all properties, where required, and these are listed below.

The following measures are proposed to mitigate potential construction impacts where identified:

1. Mitigation measures regarding traffic, air and noise are outlined in Chapter 6: Traffic & Transportation, Chapter 12: Air Quality and Chapter 14: Noise & Vibration. The implementation of the measures outlined in these chapters will ensure that the potential effects from the construction of these roads on traffic, air and noise will not be significant from an agricultural perspective.
2. A LLO will be appointed by the local authority. The LLO will keep in contact with the local farmers and agri-contractors. Any concerns or issues that may occur regarding upcoming or current road usage (or any other issues) for the movement of stock or harvesting of crops will be discussed and accommodated where possible.
3. All drainage likely to be affected or disturbed during the construction works will be identified during discussions with landowners. Efforts will be made to maintain land drains during the course of the works. Any damage due to the works will be made good on completion of the works. Damage to crops and soils by flooding as a result of the construction of the Proposed Development, will be rectified and/or compensated.
4. Any lands temporarily acquired will, before return to the landowner, be subsoiled to alleviate compaction and minimise risk of impeded crop growth (subsoiling is mechanical deep-ripping that breaks compacted subsoil layers to restore porosity and root penetration; it shall be carried out in suitable moisture conditions and avoiding buried drains/utilities).
5. Existing accesses to property, including homes, farms and severed lands will, where practicable, be maintained during construction of the road, otherwise, reasonable temporary access will be provided.
6. Temporary stockproof fencing will be erected in locations where livestock containment or protection of adjoining landowners' property is required during the construction works. This includes areas where existing fencing is removed, damaged, or insufficient to safely contain stock. Where any fences, walls or hedges are damaged during the construction of these roads they will be made stock proof immediately, unless otherwise agreed with the landowner. Any necessary permanent restoration of fences, walls, or hedges will be completed within two months of the work concluding.
7. Any disruption to animal water supplies will be reinstated immediately by the Contractor or an alternative source supplied until the source is reinstated, unless otherwise agreed with the landowner.

8. All machinery coming from outside of the State will be cleaned and disinfected on entry to the country.
9. All machines will be sprayed with appropriate disinfectant prior to arrival on site. The Contractor will verify to the LLO that this has been done.
10. The LLO will liaise with the local District Veterinary Office to establish the location of any restricted herds along the route of the Proposed Development. The liaison will continue on a regular basis throughout the construction and reinstatement periods. Where any landholder becomes aware that their herd has become infected, it is their responsibility to inform the LLO as a matter of urgency.
11. Where the LLO has been informed of a restricted herd along the route, it will require the Contractor to disinfect machinery and personnel before leaving the land concerned. The number of accesses across the working strip will be reduced to one in the case of lands having restricted herd status. The Contractor will arrange for disinfectant mats/baths to be replenished with disinfectants, as required.
12. In the event of an outbreak of a Notifiable Disease<sup>8</sup>, the proposed project will be subject to such operational restrictions as are imposed by the Department of Agriculture Food and the Marine (DAFM).

### 15.8.2 Operational Phase Mitigation Measures

Similar to the construction mitigation measures mentioned previously, operational mitigation measures have been considered on a farm-by-farm basis and details of these measures are shown in the individual assessments in Table 15.30 through Table 15.32. However, there are a number of measures that will be implemented across all farms, where required, and these are listed below:

1. Permanent and temporary landtake, including the implications this may have on area-based entitlements, will be dealt with by way of compensation.
2. Loss of facilities will all form part of the overall compensation package to be agreed with the landowner.
3. Where required access will be provided to all severed lands.
4. Ducting will be provided to facilitate the provision of services (electrical/water) across the newly developed road to severed areas, subject to technical and site-specific feasibility.
5. Where required, suitable stock proof fencing shall be erected along the Proposed Development.
6. The maintenance and replacement of the road fencing will be the responsibility of the local authority.

### 15.8.3 Predicted Residual Impacts

#### 15.8.3.1 Section 1

Section 1 of the Proposed Development will not have a significant impact on agriculture from a county or local perspective as the landtake is a very small percentage of the overall land available for the county and local area (0.08% and 3% respectively). It will have an impact from an individual farm perspective primarily from a loss of agricultural land and severance/division.

In summary, Section 1 of the Proposed Development will have a permanent negative residual impact on 97 landowners as shown in Table 15.25 and in Table 15.30 of this report.

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.gov.ie/en/department-of-agriculture-food-and-the-marine/publications/list-of-notifiable-diseases/>

**Table 15.25: Residual Impact and Nos. – Section 1**

<b>Residual Impact</b>	<b>No.s</b>
<b>Imperceptible</b>	14
<b>Slight</b>	20
<b>Moderate</b>	23
<b>Major</b>	41
<b>Profound</b>	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>

### 15.8.3.2 Section 2

Section 2 of the Proposed Development will not have a significant impact on agriculture from a county or local perspective as the landtake is a very small percentage of the overall land available for the county and local area (0.04% and 2% respectively). It will have an impact from an individual farm perspective primarily from a loss of agricultural land and severance/division.

In summary, Section 2 of the Proposed Development will have a permanent negative residual impact on 75 landowners as shown in Table 15.26 and in Table 15.31 of this report.

**Table 15.26: Residual Impact and Nos. – Section 2**

<b>Residual Impact</b>	<b>Nos</b>
<b>Imperceptible</b>	1
<b>Slight</b>	29
<b>Moderate</b>	16
<b>Major</b>	18
<b>Profound</b>	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>

### 15.8.3.3 Section 3

Section 3 of the Proposed Development will not have a significant impact on agriculture from a county or local perspective as the landtake is a very small percentage of the overall land available for the county and local area (0.1% and 2% respectively). It will have an impact from an individual farm perspective primarily from a loss of agricultural land and severance/division.

In summary, Section 3 of the Proposed Development will have a permanent negative residual impact on 72 landowners as shown in Table 15.27 and in Table 15.32 of this report.

**Table 15.27: Residual Impact and Nos. – Section 3**

<b>Residual Impact</b>	<b>Nos</b>
<b>Imperceptible</b>	7
<b>Slight</b>	19
<b>Moderate</b>	35
<b>Major</b>	20
<b>Profound</b>	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>

## 15.9 Project Wide Effects

Overall, the Proposed Development will not have a significant impact on agriculture from a county perspective. It will have an impact from an individual farm perspective primarily from a loss of agricultural land and severance/division.

The overall effects of the Project have been assessed on the basis that the Project is built in its entirety. These effects include noise, air quality, traffic, drainage, disruption of water to stock, landtake, and severance/division. Given the proximity of the three sections, potential interactions of effects have been considered within the overall assessment. In summary, the Proposed Development will have a permanent negative residual impact on 244 landowners as shown in Table 15.28 and in Table 15.30 through Table 15.32 of this report.

**Table 15.28: Residual Impact and Total Nos.**

Residual Impact	Number
Imperceptible	22
Slight	68
Moderate	74
Major	79
Profound	14
<b>Total</b>	<b>257</b>

## 15.10 Transboundary Effects

The Proposed Development is adjacent to the border with Northern Ireland at Lifford / Strabane. The Proposed Development includes the N14/N15 to A5 Link at the eastern end of Section 3. This comprises a connection from the N14/N15 Lifford Junction, south of Lifford, across the River Finn to the border with Northern Ireland. This will then connect to a proposed Trunk Road T3 which in turn connects to the proposed A5 Western Transport Corridor (A5 WTC) to be pursued by the Department for Infrastructure in Northern Ireland.

The proposed N14/N15 to A5 WTC Link including the proposed bridge over the River Finn (i.e. the link between the N14/N15 Lifford Junction and a proposed Trunk Road T3) will not be constructed until such time as a proposed Trunk Road T3 / Section 1 of the A5 WTC has been constructed or is under construction.

There is no agricultural landtake in Northern Ireland for the Proposed Development. As summarised in the preceding section, the Proposed Development does not have a significant impact on agriculture from a county perspective and, by extension, will not have a significant impact on agriculture in Northern Ireland either. Therefore, there are no significant transboundary effects in relation to Material Assets: Agriculture.

## 15.11 Summary

Table 15.29 shows a summary of the effects on agriculture as a whole in the area of the aforementioned EDs (local). While many of the construction impacts when considered on an individual basis are likely and significant, they are not significant when considered from a whole of agriculture perspective. The only effects considered to have an effect from a whole of agriculture perspective prior to mitigation are landtake and severance/division. Therefore, only landtake and severance/division are included in the Table 15.29.

**Table 15.29: Summary of Potential Environment Effects, Mitigation and Monitoring from an ED perspective**

Description of impact	Measures adopted as part of the project	Magnitude of impact	Sensitivity of receptor	Significance of effect	Mitigation measures	Residual effect	Proposed monitoring
<b>Landtake</b>	N/A	Low	Medium	Slight	N/A	Slight	N/A
<b>Severance</b>	N/A	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Access will be provided for severed portions. This access will be way of accommodation roads in most cases. However, overbridges and underpasses will be provided to mitigate the effects of severance/division on some individual properties	Slight	N/A

The effects of the Proposed Development have been considered and assessed on an individual basis and the completed assessments are shown in Table 15.30 through Table 15.32.

**Table 15.30: Section 1 - Completed Assessments**

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accomm. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1003	Grade 4	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	Yes	4.31	0.026	1%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Slight	Reinstate existing field gate	Slight
1004	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	13.42	1.611	12%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Reinstate existing field gate	Moderate
1005	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	9.08	2.175	24%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1008	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	7.73	3.715	48%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1009	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	1.27	1.219	96%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1010	Grade 3b	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	0.83	0.188	23%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
1012	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	0.19	0.029	15%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
1013	Grade 3b	Forestry	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	12.23	2.988	24%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1015	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	9.29	3.295	35%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1016	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	8.27	3.109	38%	Yes	Yes	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1018	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	1.99	0.399	20%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1019	Grade 4	Forestry	Moderate	Other	Yes	7.87	1.627	21%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1020	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	2.18	1.149	53%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
1022	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	Yes	1.89	0.000	0%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1025	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	5.74	2.154	38%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Reinstate existing field gate	Major
1026	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	11.4	3.743	33%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1027	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	31.56	18.273	58%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1028	Grade 3a	Dairy	Moderate	Paddock grazing	Yes	14.04	0.721	5%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Reinstate existing field gate	Moderate
1029	Grade 3a	Dairy	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	13.9	3.224	23%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1033	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.09	0.000	0%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
1035	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	5.32	1.076	20%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1036	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	11.1	0.339	3%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1037	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	2.79	0.473	17%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1038	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	1.81	0.260	14%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1039	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	4.3	0.778	18%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1040	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	2.2	0.728	33%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accommod. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1041	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	1.43	1.421	99%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1042	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	0.6	0.308	51%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
1045	Grade 3b	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	0.27	0.243	90%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
1049	Grade 4	Forestry	Moderate	Other	Yes	39.96	1.045	3%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1050	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	15.75	7.762	49%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1051	Grade 4	Forestry	Moderate	Other	Yes	0.15	0.136	91%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Imperceptible
1052	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	18.3	4.898	27%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1053	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	5.66	1.662	29%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
1054	Grade 5	Forestry	Moderate	Other	Yes	16.83	4.971	30%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1055	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	8.66	5.039	58%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1056	Grade 2	Tillage	Extensive	Silage	Yes	2.74	0.392	14%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
1057	Grade 3b	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	2.71	1.019	38%	No	Yes	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1059	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	1.9	0.000	0%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
1060	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	1.67	0.145	9%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
1061	Grade 3b	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	1.07	0.579	54%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1067	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	24.62	5.010	20%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1068	Grade 3a	Sheep	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	22.26	6.280	28%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Moderate	Underpass	Moderate
1071	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	30.27	2.816	9%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1072	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	8.2	1.752	21%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1073	Grade 4	Horticulture	Intense	Other	Yes	1.11	0.038	3%	No	Yes	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1075	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	1.67	0.302	18%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
1076	Grade 3b	Dairy	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	11.8	0.198	2%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1077	Grade 3a	Horticulture	Intense	Vegetables	Yes	23.95	3.812	16%	Yes	No	Yes	High	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1078	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	20.96	2.159	10%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Overbridge	Major
1079	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	38	5.690	15%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Overbridge	Major
1080	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	7.44	3.334	45%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Overbridge	Major
1081	Grade 3b	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	6.57	1.319	20%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1082	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	23.83	8.085	34%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1083	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	33.3	7.171	22%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1084	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	3.48	0.018	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	New field gate(s)	Imperceptible

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1086	Grade 3a	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	34.35	4.658	14%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1087	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	21.92	7.606	35%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1088	Grade 4	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	3.88	2.334	60%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1089	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	4.67	0.540	12%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
1091	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	3.35	0.267	8%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1092	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	47.3	5.584	12%	Yes	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
1094	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	4.15	0.136	3%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	New field gate(s)	Imperceptible
1095	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	10.63	0.311	3%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	Accommodation lane	Slight
1096	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	10.12	2.863	28%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1097	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	9.97	2.590	26%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1098	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	No	16.91	0.153	1%	No	No	No	Low	Negligible	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
1099	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	42.77	8.334	19%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1100	Grade 3b	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	No	21.18	0.287	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	New field gate(s)	Imperceptible
1101	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	17.91	8.257	46%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1102	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	14.63	0.092	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
1103	Grade 3b	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	12.28	2.326	19%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
1104	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	0.84	0.012	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	New field gate(s)	Imperceptible
1107	Grade 3b	Forestry	Intense	Other	Yes	38.73	2.900	7%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
1108	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	24.01	3.308	14%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
1109	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	No	11.52	0.170	1%	No	No	No	Medium	Negligible	Slight	None	Imperceptible
1110	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	17.25	2.801	16%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
1111	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	13.95	3.836	28%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
1112	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	6.07	1.068	18%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1113	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	0.91	0.600	66%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1115	Grade 3b	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	5.12	0.004	0%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
1122	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	10.35	1.695	16%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1123	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	3.83	0.780	20%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
1124	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	10.68	0.418	4%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	Accommodation lane	Slight

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
1125	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	11.02	3.198	29%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
1126	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	16.01	1.348	8%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
1127	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	3.48	0.323	9%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
1132	Grade 3a	Beef	Extensive	Silage	Yes	7.13	0.134	2%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	Reinstate existing field gate	Slight
1147	Grade 4	Drystock	Low	Other	Yes	0.24	0.240	100%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1151	Grade 4	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	5.62	0.082	1%	No	No	No	Medium	Negligible	Slight	None	Imperceptible
1153	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	3.93	0.045	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	Accommodation lane	Imperceptible
1162	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	2.86	0.568	20%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
1167	Grade 4	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	22.05	0.327	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
1182	Grade 4	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	0.79	0.006	1%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
1183	Grade 3b	Horses	Low	Field grazing	No	1.09	0.103	9%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	New field gate(s)	Imperceptible
1184	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	0.22	0.000	0%	No	No	No	Low	Negligible	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
1188	Grade 2	Tillage	Extensive	Silage	Yes	2.22	0.209	9%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
1800	Grade 5	Scrub	Low	Other	No	0.168	0.047	28%	No	No	Yes	Low	Negligible	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
1900	Grade 4	Fallow	Extensive	Other	Yes	0.972	0.975	100%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Profound	None	Profound

**Table 15.31: Section 2 - Completed Assessments**

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accomm. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
2001	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	2.85	0.047	2%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2002	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	2.44	0.933	38%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2003	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	2.18	0.775	36%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2004	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	5.2	2.247	43%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2005	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	12.68	2.940	23%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2006	Grade 3b	Dairy	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	4.2	1.500	36%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2007	Grade 3a	Sheep	Low	Field grazing	Yes	6.94	1.735	25%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2010	Grade 4	Fallow	Low	Other	Yes	0.29	0.061	21%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Slight
2011	Grade 3a	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	5.31	2.309	43%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
2013	Grade 3a	Beef+	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	5.34	0.342	6%	Yes	No	No	High	Medium	Major	Reinstate existing field gate	Major
2014	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	11.18	0.090	1%	No	No	No	Low	Medium	Slight	None	Slight
2015	Grade 3a	Beef+	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	3.34	2.283	68%	Yes	No	Yes	High	Medium	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
2016	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	3.34	0.127	4%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Negligible	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
2017	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	3.82	1.584	41%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2021	Grade 3b	Beef	Beef	Beef	Yes	33.74	0.469	1%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2024	Grade 3a	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.25	0.039	15%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	Reinstate existing field gate	Slight
2025	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	12.89	0.373	3%	Yes	No	No	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
2027	Grade 3b	Forestry	Intense	Other	Yes	11.76	11.724	100%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Profound	None	Profound
2028	Grade 4	Fallow	Low	Other	Yes	0.49	0.186	38%	No	No	No	Negligible	High	Slight	None	Slight
2029	Grade 4	Fallow	Low	Other	Yes	0.29	0.124	43%	No	No	No	Negligible	High	Slight	None	Slight
2035	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	0.86	0.190	22%	No	No	No	Low	low	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2038	Grade 3a	Beef+	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	14.2	5.952	42%	Yes	No	Yes	High	Medium	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
2039	Grade 3b	Beef+	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	19.9	7.893	40%	Yes	Yes	Yes	High	Medium	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
2042	Grade 3b	Horses	Low	Field grazing	Yes	31.48	1.400	4%	Yes	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2043	Grade 3b	Dairy	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	21.85	0.939	4%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2044	Grade 5	Fallow	Low	Other	No	23.31	0.000	0%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2045	Grade 3b	Beef+	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	11.03	2.979	27%	Yes	No	Yes	High	Medium	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
2046	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	1.74	1.590	91%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
2053	Grade 3a	Beef+	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	24.33	2.8	12%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2054	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	2.66	1.65	62%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Major	None	Major
2055	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	Yes	0.14	0.003	2%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
2065	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	2.21	0.57	26%	No	No	No	Low	low	Moderate	None	Moderate
2066	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	2.48	2.33	94%	No	No	No	Low	High	Major	None	Major
2068	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	Yes	2.76	0.3	11%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Slight	None	Slight
2070	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	5.29	5.01	95%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Major	None	Major
2071	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	15.02	1.87	12%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2074	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.31	0.29	94%	Yes	No	Yes	Low	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
2076	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	3.43	3.43	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Profound	None	Profound
2077	Grade 5	Scrub	Low	Other	No	2.81	2.74	98%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Major	None	Major
2078	Grade 5	Scrub	Low	Other	No	7.69	2.75	36%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
2081	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	1.74	1.741	100%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Profound	None	Profound
2084	Grade 3a	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	10.84	2.245	21%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
2086	Grade 3b	Sheep	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	10.27	0.330	3%	Yes	No	Yes	Low	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
2094	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	6.86	2.805	41%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
2095	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	18.19	5.771	32%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
2096	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	4.2	0.281	7%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2097	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	12.07	5.746	48%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
2098	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	1.79	1.737	97%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2099	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	0.23	0.213	92%	No	No	No	Low	High	Profound	None	Profound
2100	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	0.39	0.207	53%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2101	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	0.22	0.047	22%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2107	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	22.46	2.281	10%	No	No	No	Low	Medium	Slight	None	Slight
2114	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	16.3	1.065	7%	No	Facility Removed	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
2115	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	Yes	2.79	0.091	3%	No	No	No	Low	low	Slight	None	Slight
2116	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	4.06	1.502	37%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
2119	Grade 4	Horses	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	2.44	1.426	58%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
2120	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.3	0.270	90%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
2121	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	0.9	0.143	16%	No	No	No	Low	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
2126	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	4.98	0.006	0%	No	No	Yes	Low	Negligible	Slight	None	Slight
2134	Grade 3b	NA	NA	NA	No	0.46	0.122	26%	No	No	No	Low	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
2138	Grade 5	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.08	0.077	96%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Profound	None	Profound
2143	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	0.66	0.078	12%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2145	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	No	29.04	0.207	1%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2146	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Silage	No	5.37	0.880	16%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2148	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Silage	No	3.29	0.223	7%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2149	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Silage	No	0.7	0.695	99%	No	No	No	Low	High	Profound	None	Profound
2150	Grade 3b	Drystock	High	Silage	Yes	12.62	0.599	5%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
2159	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	0.26	0.020	8%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
2160	Grade 4	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	0.38	0.378	99%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Profound	None	Profound
2177	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	Yes	10.02	0.029	0%	No	No	Yes	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accomm. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
2185	Grade 3b	Drystock	Extensive	Field grazing	No	0.56	0.133	24%	No	No	No	Low	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
2801	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	0.74	0.740	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Profound	None	Profound

**Table 15.32: Section 3 – Completed Assessment**

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
3001	Grade 3b	Tillage	Intense	Silage	Yes	51.17	10.482	20%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3002	Grade 3a	Fodder	Moderate	Silage	Yes	27.304	7.862	29%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3003	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	No	1.781	1.749	98%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Profound	None	Profound
3004	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	52.827	2.892	5%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	Accommodation lane	Slight
3005	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	21.955	3.021	14%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3006	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	12.274	2.128	17%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3007	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	36.273	5.423	15%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3008	Grade 3b	Fodder	Moderate	Silage	Yes	21.302	8.318	39%	Yes	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3010	Grade 5	Scrub	Low	Other	No	0.111	0.111	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3011	Grade 5	Scrub	Low	Other	No	0.181	0.181	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3015	Grade 3a	Dairy	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	44.128	7.529	17%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Underpass	Major
3017	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	18.336	5.975	33%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3018	Grade 3a	Dairy	Intense	Field grazing	No	19.644	0.143	1%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3019	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.067	0.067	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3021	Grade 3a	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	24.544	4.053	17%	Yes	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3022	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.017	0.017	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Slight	None	Slight

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
3023	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	12.482	4.036	32%	No	No	No	Low	Medium	Slight	None	Slight
3024	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	11.869	2.637	22%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3025	Grade 3b	Horses	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	25.646	5.120	20%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3029	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	No	3.241	2.216	68%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3030	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	9.065	1.624	18%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3031	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Silage	No	1.662	1.666	100%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Profound	None	Profound
3032	Grade 3b	Drystock	Low	Field grazing	No	0.767	0.117	15%	No	No	No	Low	Medium	Slight	None	Slight
3033	Grade 3a	Tillage	Moderate	Cereals	Yes	80.156	17.568	22%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3034	Grade 4	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	No	29.362	1.034	4%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3037	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	No	1.926	0.295	15%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3038	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	39.206	7.708	20%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3039	Grade 3a	Dairy	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	18.554	3.314	18%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3041	Grade 3a	Dairy	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	50.111	9.526	19%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3042	Grade 3a	Vegetables	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	13.703	5.279	39%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3044	Grade 3a	Tillage	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	29.569	3.098	10%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	Accommodation lane	Slight
3045	Grade 3b	Tillage	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	40.3	5.970	15%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3048	Grade 3b	Fallow	Moderate	Silage	No	0.885	0.885	100%	No	No	No	Negligible	High	Profound	None	Profound
3049	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.13	0.130	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Slight	None	Slight
3057	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.008	0.008	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Slight	None	Slight
3058	Grade 3b	Tillage	Moderate	Vegetables	No	35.282	4.292	12%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3059	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	No	21.5	3.207	15%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accommod. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
3060	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	19.519	0.790	4%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3061	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	11.689	2.835	24%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3062	Grade 3b	Dairy	Moderate	Field grazing	No	8.349	2.512	30%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3064	Grade 3a	Tillage	Moderate	Cereals	Yes	32.002	2.224	7%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3065	Grade 3a	Tillage	Moderate	Silage	Yes	34.571	4.773	14%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3068	Grade 3a	Pig Unit	Moderate	Other	Yes	65.446	5.751	9%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
3069	Grade 3b	Forestry	Moderate	Other	Yes	22.958	3.201	14%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
3070	Grade 3a	Dairy+	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	26.484	3.491	13%	No	No	No	High	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3071	Grade 3a	Dairy+	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	11.274	0.977	9%	No	No	Yes	High	Medium	Moderate	Reinstate existing field gate	Moderate
3072	Grade 3a	Dairy+	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	27.7	8.332	30%	Yes	No	Yes	High	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3073	Grade 3a	Beef	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	20.03	0.117	1%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3074	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	51.064	7.686	15%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3075	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	No	9.459	0.300	3%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Low	Slight	Accommodation lane	Slight
3076	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	2.838	2.554	90%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Profound	None	Profound
3077	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.013	0.013	100%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Slight	None	Slight
3080	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	20.704	4.532	22%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	New field gate(s)	Major
3081	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	23.991	8.110	34%	No	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3082	Grade 3b	Dairy+	Intense	Silage	No	3.779	2.408	64%	No	No	No	High	High	Profound	None	Profound

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accom. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
3088	Grade 3b	Dairy	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	20.07	0.578	3%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3089	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Silage	Yes	20.3	2.348	12%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3090	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	7.537	1.764	23%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3091	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.13	0.130	100%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
3092	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	18.831	6.783	36%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Underpass	Major
3094	Grade 3a	Beef	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	9.39	2.750	29%	No	No	Yes	High	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3101	Grade 3a	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	16.984	8.664	51%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3103	Grade 3a	Tillage	Moderate	Cereals	Yes	52.855	8.040	15%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3104	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	No	6.995	3.677	53%	No	No	No	Medium	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate
3105	Grade 3a	Fodder	Moderate	Silage	No	5.161	2.334	45%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	Accommodation lane	Moderate
3106	Grade 3a	Dairy	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	33.702	5.931	18%	No	No	Yes	Medium	Medium	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3107	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	1.493	0.843	56%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
3108	Grade 3a	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	No	17.076	0.691	4%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3109	Grade 3b	Tillage	Moderate	Cereals	No	13.74	0.054	0%	No	No	No	Medium	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3110	Grade 3b	Horses	Moderate	Silage	Yes	18.312	2.684	15%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Underpass	Moderate
3111	Grade 3a	Horses	Moderate	Field grazing	No	3.085	0.300	10%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
3112	Grade 3a	Tillage	Moderate	Cereals	Yes	32.007	4.604	14%	Yes	No	Yes	Medium	High	Major	Underpass	Major
3120	Grade 3a	Dairy+	Very Intense	Field grazing	Yes	12.96	11.544	89%	Yes	No	Yes	High	High	Major	Accommodation lane	Major
3121	Grade 3a	Fodder	Moderate	Silage	No	6.663	0.620	9%	No	No	Yes	Low	Medium	Slight	New field gate(s)	Slight
3127	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	11.187	0.750	7%	No	No	No	Low	Medium	Moderate	None	Moderate

Farm ID	Land Quality (Note 1)	Primary Enterprise	Intensity Primary (Note 2)	Primary Crop Affected	Drainage Affected	Land Parcel (ha)	Landtake (ha)	Landtake (%)	Severance	Facilities Affected (Note 3)	Access Required	Value Sensitivity (Note 4)	Magnitude (Note 4)	Significance (Note 4)	Possible Accomm. 1	Significance of Residual Effect
3139	Grade 5	Scrub	Low	Other	No	0.53	0.281	53%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3142	Grade 3b	Sheep	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.69	0.017	2%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3143	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	7.801	0.308	4%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3144	Grade 3b	Dairy	Moderate	Silage	No	20.336	3.754	18%	No	No	No	Medium	High	Major	None	Major
3145	Grade 3b	Drystock	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	2.713	0.047	2%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3155	Grade 3b	Dairy+	High	Field grazing	Yes	19.59	0.226	1%	No	No	No	High	Low	Slight	None	Slight
3158	Grade 4	Other	Moderate	Other	No	0.183	0.183	100%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	None	Moderate
3163	Grade 3a	Dairy	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	2.87	0.643	22%	No	No	Yes	Low	High	Moderate	New field gate(s)	Moderate
3164	Grade 3b	Tillage	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	7.65	0.315	4%	No	No	No	Low	Low	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3800	Grade 3a	Dairy+	Intense	Field grazing	Yes	0.013	0.013	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Imperceptible	None	Imperceptible
3804	Grade 3b	Beef	Moderate	Field grazing	Yes	0.324	0.324	100%	No	No	No	Low	High	Slight	None	Slight

## 15.12 References

- Census Statistics Office, (2020). *Census of Agriculture 2020-Preliminary Results*. [Online]
- Central Statistics Office, (2012). *Census of Agriculture 2010- Final Results*.
- Central Statistics Office, (2016). *Life in 1916 Ireland, Government of Ireland*.
- Central Statistics Office, (2020). *AgriMap*. [Online]
- Central Statistics Office, (2020). *Census of Agriculture*.
- Department of Housing, Planning and Local Government, (2018). *Guidelines for Planning Authorities and An Bord Pleanála on carrying out Environmental Impact Assessment*.
- Environmental Protection Agency, (2017). *Revised Guidelines on the Information to be Contained in Environmental Impact Statements*.
- Environmental Protection Agency, (2002). *Guidelines on the Information to be Contained in Environmental Impact Statements*.
- Environmental Protection Agency, (2017). *Revised Guidelines on the Information to be Contained in Environmental Impact Statements*.
- Environmental Protection Agency, (2022). *Guidelines on the information to be contained in Environmental Impact Assessment Reports (EIAR)*, EPA.
- European Commission, (2018). *European Union (Planning and Development) (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2018*.
- Highways England, (2020). *Environmental Assessment and Monitoring*, Highway's England.
- Highways England, (2020). *LA 112 Population and human health*.
- Highways England, (2020). *DMRB 2020, UK Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 112 Population and human health*.
- Horse Racing Ireland, (n.d). *Trainer Information*. [Online]
- MAFF, (1988). *Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales*.
- National Road's Authority, (2003). *Guide to Process and Code of Practice for National Road Project Planning and Acquisition of Property for National Roads*.
- National Road's Authority, (2008). *Environmental Impact Assessment of National Road Schemes- A Practical Guide*.
- Teagasc & EPA, (2009). *Irish Forest Service Soil Classification*.