



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report ABP-321790-25

Development	Residential development consisting of 6 houses and all ancillary site works and services.
Location	Corrabaun, Drumlish, Co. Longford.
Planning Authority	Longford County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2460265
Applicant(s)	Paul & Michelle Brady.
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Paul & Michelle Brady.
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	8 th May 2025
Inspector	Gerard Kellett

1.0 Site Location and Description

1.1. The site is located in the townland of Corrabawn, Drumlish, Co. Longford. The proposed development site is located off the main street of Drumlish along a country road (L-1010) on the outskirts of Drumlish Village. The site comprises an existing single storey cottage style dwelling. The proposed development would be sited behind the existing dwelling which is essentially a greenfield site. The northern, southern and eastern boundaries of the site are defined by mature trees and hedging. The site rises gradually west to east. Access to the site is proposed through the existing entrance. Along the frontage of the site is an existing footpath. The site has a stated area of 0.414 hectares.

2.0 Proposed Development

2.1. Permission is sought for:

- a) 6. No semi-detached (2 bedroom) single-storey dwelling houses; each with a stated floor area of 82.2sqm and an overall height of 6.1 metres.
- b) New augmented entrance and access road.
- c) Boundary walls, piers, and fencing.
- d) Lighting, footpaths, and green open space.
- e) Provision of all associated surface water and foul drainage services and connections.
- f) All ancillary site works and services

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

The Planning Authority refused permission on the 7th of January 2025 for the following reason:

- 1) The proposed development site is located outside the Development envelope of Drumlish and as such is not zoned for housing or any other type of development. The proposed development is considered to be a significant over-development of the proposed site. The proposed development and the precedent it would set would materially contravene the County Development Plan and be contrary to the proper and sustainable development of the area.
- 2) The Planning Authority is not satisfied with the submitted site layout, particularly with regard to design, layout, parking and access through rear gardens. This is contrary to DMS 16.28 which requires that “Public open space should be innovative in its design approach and designed to be functionally accessible to the maximum number of dwellings within the residential area”. As such the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- 3) It is considered that the proposed development constitutes haphazard backland residential development, being situated at the rear of existing buildings which would be injurious to the amenities of adjoining properties. The proposed development would be out of character with the established residential development and would therefore set an undesirable precedent for such development in the vicinity. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planner's Report forms the basis for the decision to refuse permission.
stating:

Location Outside Development Envelope:

- The application site is located within the CSO village boundary the proposed development is located completely outside the development envelope on unzoned agricultural land. The development is considered a significant over-development of the site and would contravene the County Development Plan, being contrary to proper and sustainable development.

Design & Layout:

- The site layout is unsatisfactory, particularly regarding design, parking, and access through rear gardens. The public open space provided does not meet the requirements of DMS 16.28, which calls for innovative and functionally accessible open space. The development fails to provide adequate usable open space.

Haphazard Backland Development:

- The development constitutes inappropriate backland residential development, being situated at the rear of existing buildings. This would negatively impact the amenities of adjoining properties, be out of character with the established residential area, and set an undesirable precedent for future development in the vicinity

Other:

- Overlooking of neighbouring properties due to the elevated position of the proposed dwellings.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

- Housing Department – No objection
- Road Design – Requested further information regarding a range of issues such as the entrance in accordance with DMURS, parking design, public lighting and surface water details.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

- Uisce Eireann – No objection

3.4. Third Party Observations

Four number third-party submissions were made on the application making the following points:

- The land not being zoned for development.
- Limited road visibility at the existing entrance.
- Overloaded sewer system.
- Insufficient road width for two cars entering and exiting.
- Overlooking of existing neighbouring properties.
- Disruption to long-term residents on the rural road.

4.0 Planning History

None

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

Longford County Development Plan 2021 – 2027

The Longford County Development Plan 2021 – 2027 is the relevant Development Plan for the subject site.

The subject site is located within the defined settlement CSO boundary of Drumlish, however it sits outside the defined development envelope of Drumlish and is identified as unzoned land.

Policy objective 4.13 seeks to promote the commensurate growth in development in the 'Towns and Villages' as designated in the Settlement Hierarchy, in a consolidated, sustainable and sequential manner, with targeted investment to improve local employment, services and sustainable transport options and to become more self-sustaining.

DMS 16.28 – Public open space should be innovative in its design approach and designed to be functionally accessible to the maximum number of dwellings within the residential area.

DMS 16.19 – Encourage a density of 20 units/ha in the other towns and villages listed Aughnaccliffe, Ballinalee, Drumlish, Keenagh, Legan and Newtownforbes

16.4.5.3 Backland Sites in Urban Areas

Backland residential development relates to small scale development located to the rear of existing buildings in built-up areas. Innovative and contemporary design solutions may be considered.

DMS 16.79: Backland development proposals shall avoid piecemeal development that adversely impacts on the character of the area and the established pattern of development.

5.2. Natural Heritage Designations

The subject site is located within any Natura 2000 sites. The nearest being Lough Forbes Complex SAC (IE0001818) c6.8km to the south-west.

There are no Natural Heritage Area's (NHA) or Proposed Natural Heritage Area's (pNHA) Area in proximity.

6.0 Environmental Impact Assessment Screening

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

7.0 The Appeal

7.1. Grounds of Appeal (GOA)

A first party appeal has been lodged against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission. The grounds of appeal can be broadly summarised as follows:

Location within the Development Envelope:

The GOA insists the site is located inside the designated development envelope of Drumlish village.

Housing Demand

There is a significant shortage of suitable housing in Drumlish, particularly 2–3-bedroom single-storey dwellings, as highlighted by local auctioneer Padraic Davis. The proposed development addresses this demand. Reference made to various sections of the development with regard to need to provide housing for the elderly, persons with disabilities, lone parents, Travellers, and the homeless.

Density Compliance

The proposed development achieves a density of 17 units/ha, close to the target density of 20 units/ha outlined in the Longford County Council Development Plan 2021-2027.

Design Compatibility

The design of the proposed dwellings complements the massing and scale of the existing cottage on-site and neighbouring houses. It adheres to universal design principles, making it suitable for elderly residents and people with disabilities.

Other matters

Reference is made to a similar nearby housing development (PL04/129) that demonstrates the success of similar backland residential projects in semi-rural settings.

The GOA consider there would be no impact to residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

The site utilises existing town services, including sewer and footpath networks, and incorporates a surface water attenuation system with flow control measures.

7.2. Planning Authority Response

No response has been received to date.

7.3. Prescribed Bodies

None

7.4. Observations

None received.

8.0 Assessment

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

- Principle of Development
- Design & Layout & Parking & Access
- Backland Development
- Other Matters

8.1. Principle of Development

- 8.1.1. The Planning Authority as the first reason for refusal stated the proposed development is located outside the Development envelope of Drumlish village and as such is not zoned for housing and would materially contravene the County Development Plan.

Furthermore, the PA considered the proposed development would represent a significant over-development of the proposed site. The grounds of appeal state the site is located inside the designated development envelope of Drumlish village. That there is a significant shortage and need of suitable housing in Drumlish village, as highlighted by the submission of a local auctioneer letter.

8.1.2. Whilst I note the grounds of appeal with regard the need for housing in the area, I have had regard to the relevant provisions of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027, where Drumlish village is designated within the ‘Towns and Villages’ Settlement Hierarchy Tier as per table 4.13 of the plan. In that context policy objective 4.13 of the plan seeks to promote the commensurate growth in development in the ‘Towns and Villages’ as designated in the Settlement Hierarchy, in a consolidated, sustainable and sequential manner. I have reviewed the zoning map for Drumlish village and note whilst the application site is located within the Central Statistic Office (CSO) village boundary the proposed development is located completely outside the development envelope of the village. Moreover, I consider the site is located on unzoned land/open countryside, designated as a Rural Area Under Strong Urban Influence as identified in figure 4.5 of the plan, where compliance with Section 4.8.12 of the plan is required. Section 4.8.12 sets out the Rural Settlement Strategy for County Longford including specific rural housing policy objectives including policy objective CPO 4.24 of the plan which refers to applications for permanent residential development in ‘Rural Areas Under Strong Urban Influence’ must comply with local need criteria. I note no information to justify local need criteria as per policy objective CPO 4.24 of the plan has been provided with this application.

8.1.3. In my professional opinion, the proposed development located entirely outside the defined development envelope of Drumlish village does not comply with the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy Objective 4.13 of the current County Development Plan. There are zoned lands available within the development boundary of the village, and

in accordance with the sequential approach advocated by policy objective 4.13, these lands should be prioritised for development.

- 8.1.4. Permitting development beyond the defined settlement boundary would, in my view, represent unsustainable leapfrogging into the open countryside, where local need criteria would typically apply. As such, the proposed development undermines the Plan led approach to growth and fails to contribute to the sustainable consolidation of the village.
- 8.1.5. Therefore it is my view that the principle of the proposed development of six dwellings located on lands outside the development envelope of village of Drumlish is not acceptable as it would materially contravene policy objective 4.13 of the Core Strategy of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027, which seeks to promote the commensurate growth in development in the ‘Towns and Villages’ as designated in the Settlement Hierarchy, in a consolidated, sustainable and sequential manner as set out in the Core Strategy of the plan. Therefore, it is recommended that permission should be refused for the development on this basis.
- 8.1.6. If the Board is of a mind to grant permission, I would refer to section 37(2)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended), which states the Board may only grant permission even if the proposed development materially contravenes the development plan where it considers that one of the following circumstances/criteria of section 37(2)(b) of the Act apply. The criteria is set out below —

(i) the proposed development is of strategic or national importance,

(ii) there are conflicting objectives in the development plan or the objectives are not clearly stated, insofar as the proposed development is concerned,

or

(iii) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to [regional spatial and economic strategy] for the area, guidelines under section 28, policy directives under section 29, the statutory obligations of any local authority in the area, and any relevant policy of the Government, the Minister or any Minister of the Government, or

(iv) permission for the proposed development should be granted having regard to the pattern of development, and permissions granted, in the area since the making of the development plan.

8.1.7. It is my view considering the nature and location of the proposed development outside the development envelope of village of Drumlish would not be of strategic or national importance, that there are no specific guidelines for such development nor conflicting objectives in the development plan nor any similar types of development granted in the area since the making of the development plan that I am aware of and as such I do not consider the proposed development has been clearly justified under the material contravention provisions of section 37(2)(b) of the Act. Therefore, I do not consider a material contravention under 37(2)(b) is justified in this instance.

8.1.8. In the interest of transparency, I will address the other reasons for refusal below.

8.2. Design & Layout & Parking & Access

8.2.1. The Planning Authority second reason for refusal stated the proposed design, layout, parking and access through rear gardens would be contrary to policy objective DMS 16.28 of the Plan which requires that public open space should be innovative in its design approach. The GOA refer that the design of the proposed dwellings complements the massing and scale of the existing cottage on-site and neighbouring houses.

Design

- 8.2.2. I note the design of the residential units which I consider to be generally acceptable. As stated, it is my view that the subject site is located within a countryside location where policy objective CPO 4.44 of Plan refers to the design for residential development shall comply with the Rural Design Guide including use of plastered walls and simple design forms and roof designs with narrow spans (gable-widths) and pitches/profiles will generally be acceptable. In my opinion the units being single storey in character with an overall height of 6.1 metres and total floor area of 82.2 sqm, with an A-gabled roofed design and small porch and materials would complement the size, scale and massing of the existing cottage to the immediate west (within the applicant's landholding) and generally in accordance with CPO 4.44 of the Plan and annex no7. the Longford Rural Design Guide.

Layout

- 8.2.3. In terms of layout, section the Rural Design Guides as outlined in annex no.7 of the Plan states layouts should be used to maximise privacy, screening and shelter. The provided development is laid out in site L-shaped layout. The dwellings have a northeast to southwest orientation to maximise solar gain and the southeastern boundary is defined by mature vegetation that aid shelter which I consider to be generally acceptable and in accordance with the Rural Design Guide.

Parking

- 8.2.4. In terms of parking, section 16.4.8 of the Plan refers to Car Parking Standards and sets for house in a town and village centre location 1.5 spaces per unit shall be provided. I note 2 number car parking spaces would be provided and in my view in compliance with the car parking standards set out in the Plan.

Access through the rear gardens

- 8.2.5. I note that the Planning Authority, in its reason for refusal, refers to “access through the rear gardens” and cites policy DMS 16.28 of the Plan. However, it is unclear what specific aspect the Planning Authority is referencing in this regard. Policy DMS 16.28 relates to the functionality and innovation of public open space provision, rather than private access arrangements. Upon review of the submitted site layout plan, I observe that access to the rear gardens of each unit is provided via side passages, which is standard and acceptable. Furthermore, the designated public open space is located in the southwestern portion of the site and, in my opinion, is adequately overlooked by Unit 1, thus meeting passive surveillance and general design requirements. I consider the arrangement of the open space to be broadly acceptable in this context.
- 8.2.6. Notwithstanding the design, layout, parking and access, given the fundamental reason for refusal pertaining to the status of the lands which I have addressed in section 8.1 above, should be refused for the development.

8.3. Backland Development

- 8.3.1. The Planning Authority third reason for refusal stated the proposed development constitutes haphazard backland residential development, being situated at the rear of existing buildings which would be injurious to the amenities of adjoining properties. The proposed development would be out of character with the established residential development and would therefore set an undesirable precedent for such development in the vicinity. The GOA consider the development is backland and refer to DMS 16.79 of the Plan which refers to promotion of backland development.
- 8.3.2. I have regard to section 16.4.5.3 (Backland Sites in Urban Areas) of the Plan that refers to backland residential development of small-scale development located to the rear of existing buildings in built-up areas. I note section 16.4.5.3 make no reference to backland development for unzoned lands. DMS 16.79 of the Plan states backland

development proposals shall avoid piecemeal development that adversely impacts on the character of the area and the established pattern of development. In that context I note the existing site is set to the rear of an existing dwelling where the character of the area is mainly defined by line of one-off individual dwellings that front onto the adjoining road. It is my view that the proposed development located at the rear of existing buildings is unacceptable and is considered to constitute haphazard backland residential development on unzoned lands, would be out of character with the established built form development fronting onto the adjoining public road and in my view would be contrary to DMS 16.79 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027, which seeks to avoid backland development that adversely impacts on the character of the area and the established pattern of development.

- 8.3.3. Having regard to the foregoing, I consider the proposed development is not acceptable and would be contrary to DMS 16.79 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027, which seeks to avoid backland development that adversely impacts on the character of the area and the established pattern of development. Therefore, it is recommended that permission should be refused for the development on this basis.

8.4. Other Matters

- 8.4.1. Residential Amenity concerns were raised by the PA regarding overshadowing and overlooking onto neighbouring properties. I note the development comprises 6no. single storey dwellings in character. The location of nos. 1-4 would have a southwest to northeast orientation, while the nos. 5-6 would face southwest. All units being single storey and set from the neighbouring boundaries by c 5metres is in my view unlikely to cause adverse impact to residential properties in terms of any overlooking or overshadowing.
- 8.4.2. Whilst I note the GOA insist there is a significant shortage of suitable housing in Drumlish, as highlighted by local auctioneer Padraic Davis, it is my view the proposed development is not appropriately zoned in the first instance. The development would

set an undesirable precedent for similar such forms of ad-hoc development in the rural area as reference in section 8.1.

- 8.4.3. I note the proposed density of 17 units/ha which I consider is broadly in compliance with DMS 16.19 of the Plan which encourages a density range of 20 units/ha. Moreover, I note the design and internal layout referenced in the GOA broadly adheres to universal design principles such as accessible access making it suitable for elderly residents and people with disabilities.
- 8.4.4. Precedent has been raised by the GOA with reference to a similar nearby housing development to the southwest under planning reference number 04/129 for 12 units. It is my view that this relates to a different site context and County Development Plan in force at that time and that all applications are assessed on their own merits having regard to the sensitivity of the receiving environment and the specifics of the proposed development.
- 8.4.5. I note the GOA set out the site utilises existing town services, including public sewer and footpath networks, and incorporates a surface water attenuation system with flow control measures and I note the pre-connection enquiry with the submission from Irish Water stating connection to public services is feasible. Notwithstanding, given the fundamental reason for refusal pertaining to the status of the lands which I have addressed in section 8.1 above, it is recommended that permission should be refused for the development.

9.0 Appropriate Assessment Screening

9.1. In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Lough Forbes Complex SAC (IE0001818) or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required. Refer to appendix 3.

9.2. This determination is based on:

- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites
- No significant ex-situ impacts on wintering birds

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that PERMISSION should be REFUSED for the reasons and considerations as set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

11.1. The proposed development, which is located outside the development envelope of the village of Drumlish and within the open countryside, would materially contravene policy objective 4.13 of the Core Strategy of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027, which seeks to promote the commensurate growth in development in the ‘Towns and Villages’ as designated in the Settlement Hierarchy, in a consolidated, sustainable and sequential manner established within the Core Strategy. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the rural and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

11.2. The proposed development located at the rear of existing buildings is considered constitutes haphazard backland residential development situated on unzoned lands, would be out of character with the established built form development and would be contrary to DMS 16.79 of the Longford County Development Plan 2021–2027, which seeks to avoid backland development that adversely impacts on the character of the area and the established pattern of development. The proposed development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development in the area and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

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

Gerard Kellett
Planning Inspector
13th May 2025

Appendix 1

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-321790-25
Proposed Development Summary	Residential development consisting of 6 houses and all ancillary site works and services.
Development Address	Corrabaun, Drumlish, Co. Longford.
	In all cases check box /or leave blank
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	☒ Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2. ☐ No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
☐ Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	Class 10 (b) (i)
☒ No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	

3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
☐ No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994. No Screening required.	
☐ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold. EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required	State the Class and state the relevant threshold
☒ Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold. Preliminary examination required. (Form 2) OR If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)	State the Class and state the relevant threshold Class 10 (b) (i) - Proposed development does not equal or exceed any threshold.
4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?	
Yes ☐	Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)
No ☒	Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Appendix 2

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-321790-25
Proposed Development Summary	Residential development consisting of 6 houses and all ancillary site works and services
Development Address	Corrabaun, Drumlish, Co. Longford.
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	The development has a modest footprint, comes forward as a standalone project, does not require the use of substantial natural resources, or give rise to significant risk of pollution or nuisance. The development, by virtue of its type, does not pose a risk of major accident and/or disaster, or is vulnerable to climate change. It presents no risks to human health.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	The development is situated in a serviced unzoned area and is removed from sensitive natural habitats and designated sites and landscapes of identified significance in the County Development Plan
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent,	Having regard to the nature of the proposed development, its location removed from sensitive habitats/features, likely limited magnitude and spatial extent of effects, and absence of in combination effects, there is no potential for

nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	significant effects on the environmental factors listed in section 171A of the Act.
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3

Screening for Appropriate Assessment Test for likely significant effects				
Brief description of project		Residential development consisting of 6 houses and all ancillary site works and services in the village of Drumlish		
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms		The site is c6.8 km to the southwest of the SAC.		
Screening report		N		
Natura Impact Statement		N		
Relevant submissions		None		
European Site (code)	Qualifying interests ¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections ²	Consider further in screening ³ Y/N
Lough Forbes Complex SAC (IE0001818)	<u>Species</u> Merlin - Falco columbarius White-fronted Goose (Greenland subspecies) - Anser albifrons flavirostris <u>Habitats</u> Natural eutrophic lakes with Magnopotamion or Hydrocharition - type vegetation Active raised bogs Degraded raised bogs	c 6.8 km to the southwest.	No	N

	are still capable of natural regeneration. Depressions on peat substrates of the Rhynchosporion. Alluvial forests with <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> and <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> (Alno-Padion, Alnion incanae, Salicion albae)			
Site name Qualifying interests		Possibility of significant effects (alone) in view of the conservation objectives of the site*		
	Impacts	Effects		
Lough Forbes Complex SAC (IE0001818)	Direct: None Indirect: None	There are no direct ecological connections or pathways) and distance from receiving features connected to the SAC make it highly unlikely that the proposed development could generate impacts of a magnitude that could affect habitat quality within the SAC for the SCI listed.		
		Likelihood of significant effects from proposed development (alone): No		
		If No, is there a likelihood of significant effects occurring in combination with other plans or projects? No		

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on the Lough Forbes Complex SAC. The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on the Lough Forbes Complex SAC (IE0001818) or any other European site, in view of the sites Conservation Objectives, and Appropriate Assessment (and submission of a NIS) is not therefore required.

This determination is based on:

- Distance from and weak indirect connections to the European sites.
- No significant ex-situ impacts on wintering birds.

Inspector: _____ **Date:** _____