#### PLANNING REPORT

File No:

06/3801

**Applicant:** 

Pat Ryan

Location:

Ballyfauskeen, Ballylanders.

Proposal:

Permission for construction of new loose dry sow house to comply with

new welfare regulations, adjacent to existing pig farm.

Site inspected

MG, 11th January 2007. Site notice in place.

Description of key elements of proposal and relationship to context:

Proposal involves extension to farm buildings associated with a large pig farm in the Glen of Aherlow. The site is not in a Water source protection area. There are no archaeological monuments, conservation designations or protected structures in the vicinity. The nearest houses, existing and permitted to the application site is that of the landowner and his immediate family (including outstanding planning permission 05/2342). Other than that the nearest house is 310 metres distant. Crucially the overall unit to which this extension belongs, is associated with a large holding.

This proposal requires an EIS which was submitted as part of this application, due to the cumulative scale of the unit and type which brings it over the threshold for this use category.

**Recent Planning History:** 

Current site:

None

Adjacent sites:

None

Services:

Bored well.

**Departmental Reports:** 

Internal:

None

External:

None

**Objections:** 

None

Representations:

None

**Pre-planning Discussions:** 

None

**Development Plan Policies and Objectives:** 

Limerick County Development Plan 2005:

Ground Water Protection - Policy INF 20

Development Control Guidelines- Agricultural development section 12.3.8

### Local Area Plan Policies and Objectives:

None

# National Policies / Ministerial Directives / Departmental Guidelines

See Planning and Development Regulations 2001.

#### **Assessment:**

There are no issues with this proposal. The proposal is an existing large pig unit but is in the middle of the countryside and the Planning Authority is satisfied that with adequate landscaping the visual impact of the extension, which is relatively minor, can be mitigated. The main environmental impact of a proposal of this type is likely to be from its effluent and impact of noise and smells on neighbouring residents. However in regard to the latter the nearest house not belonging to the applicant or his immediate family is 310 metres distant, so this is unlikely to pose a major problem. In regard to effluent and all aspects of possible pollution, the proposal requires an IPC licence and these matters would be dealt with through this channel.

#### **Recommendation:**

7th February 2007

Full Permission subject to the following recommendations:

### FIRST SCHEDULE &

Having regard to the proposed development and the pattern of development in the area, it is considered that, subject to the conditions set out in the Second Schedule, the proposed development would not seriously injure the amenities of the surrounding area and would be acceptable, in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

SECOND SCHEDULE

1) Std 110 · Care	
2) Std 111 ·	
3) Std 112-	
4) Std 113 <sup>1</sup>	
5) Std 114.	
6) Std 116 -	
7) Std 117 -	
8) Std 118 9 SED 119 10 9) Std 121.	
10-9) Std 121.	
الم	is regimen for this development
NOTE TO APPLICANT: An IPSC license from the	e EPA has to granted before this
rdevelopment is authorised.	
Signed: I'h chael Clehaf My Michael Geraghty Executive Planner	Signed: Kieran O'Gorman  Senior Executive Engineer
Date: 7-02-07	Date: 7.0 2.07

PA063801

## **Geraghty Michael**

From:

Murphy Finbarr

Sent:

07 February 2007 12:28

To: Subject: Geraghty Michael 06-3801 Pat Ryan

Michael,

I've had a look at this planning application regarding a piggery. The application does not propose to increase the number of pigs at the unit. The piggery is sufficiently large to require an IPCL from the EPA. The environmental issues at the farm will be governed by the conditions of the IPC licence. It appears from the planning application that the applicant has not yet applied to the EPA for the required licence, but the Environmental Impact Statement says on P3 that 'an application is to be submitted shortly'.

I recommend that the applicant be asked to produce documentary proof that he has applied to the EPA for the required IPC licence prior to, or within 4 weeks of the grant of planning permission.

Regards,

**Barry Murphy** 



### PLANNING SECTION

06/3801/KOG/VK

8<sup>th</sup> February 2007

Pat Ryan Ballyfausken Ballylanders Co Limerick

Re: Construction of a new loose dry sow honse to comply with new welfare regulations, adjacent to existing pig farm. An EIS has been submitted as part of this application at Ballyfausken, Ballylanders, Co Limerick

Planning reference no: 06/3801

Dear Sir/Madam,

I refer to your application for the above development and the notification of decision to grant permission attached and would advise you that an IPCL licence from the Environmental Protection Agency is requested for this development.

Yours faithfully,

for Director of Service Planning & Development